REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 532 UD 002 503

FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT - ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

BY- FOX, DAVID J.
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 31 AUG 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$4.36 109P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FREE CHOICE TRANSFER PROGRAMS, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, *OPEN ENROLLMENT, MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN, *EVALUATION, RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, DATA COLLECTION, QUESTIONNAIRES, TEACHING QUALITY, TEACHER ATTITUDES, ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, STUDENT ATTITUDES, STUDENT BEHAVIOR, SOCIAL RELATIONS, FRIENDSHIP, ASPIRATIONS, ATTENDANCE, READING ACHIEVEMENT, BUS TRANSPORTATION, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

THIS EVALUATIVE REPORT OF A FREE CHOICE-OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM, IN WHICH MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO TRANSFER TO SCHOOLS OUTSIDE THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS, RECORDED THE RESPONSES OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN THE RECEIVING AND SENDING SCHOOLS. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAM WAS BASED ON 2-DAY VISITS TO 63 SCHOOLS TO GATHER OBSERVATIONAL, INTERVIEW, SOCIOMETRIC, AND SCHOOL RECORDED DATA. BECAUSE OF LIMITED TIME, MATERIAL ON THE PARENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PROGRAM AND THEIR EVALUATION OF ITS EFFECTIVENESS WAS NOT OBTAINED. GENERAL FINDINGS INDICATED LITTLE CHANGE IN THE READING ABILITY OF THE PROGRAM CHILDREN WHEN COMPARED WITH THAT OF STUDENTS REMAINING IN THE SENDING SCHOOLS. GAINS WERE OBSERVED, HOWEVER, IN SOCIAL RELATIONS, AS THERE WAS FRIENDLY INTERACTION AMONG ETHNIC GROUPS IN MOST RECEIVING SCHOOLS. BOTH PROGRAM CHILDREN AND THOSE IN THE RECEIVING SCHOOLS HAD POSITIVE IMPRESSIONS OF SCHOOL, CLASS, AND SOCIAL SITUATIONS, BUT THE STAFF FELT THAT THEIR JOB HAD BECOME MORE DIFFICULT AND THAT SCHOOL DISCIPLINE HAD DECLINED. THE PROGRAM HAD SUCH ADMINISTRATIVE DIFFICULTIES AS LACK OF BUS SUPERVISION, INSUFFICIENT ORIENTATION FOR PARTICIPANTS (PARENTS AND CHILDREN), POOR COORDINATION BETWEEN RECEIVING AND SENDING SCHOOLS, AND NOT ENOUGH PERSONNEL FOR REMEDIAL WORK IN THE RECEIVING SCHOOLS. (NC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED011532

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT - ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

UD 002 503

Dr. David J. Fox
Research Director

August 31, 1966

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURE

This project was intended to evaluate the progress of the Board of Education's Free-Choice Open Enrollment program by which minority group children are permitted to transfer to schools in districts other than the one in which they live. The particular phase of that program covered by this study and report is the Free-Choice program in the elementary schools.

To evaluate the functioning of the Free-Choice program, a two-phase study was completed. The first phase was to study the program as it functioned in the "receiving schools", that is, those schools to which children transferred. The second phase of the study was to obtain some comparison data from the "sending schools" (those schools from which children transferred) on the functioning of children who did not participate in the Free-Choice Program.

Design of Phase One: Receiving Schools

The design of the first phase of the study was to make an intensive two-day visit to a sample of the 141 receiving schools in New York City, listed by the Central Zoning Unit of the New York City Board of Education, as of October, 1965. During this visit, discussed below, a variety of observational and interview data were obtained, group paper and pencil sociometric and behavioral rating scales were administered, and clerical data were transcribed from record cards. Schools to be visited were selected on the basis of number of Open Enrollment children (hereafter referred to as OE children) on record as of September-October 1965. All 27 schools with more than 30 OE children on record at that date were selected. In addition, 11 schools with between 15 and 29 OE children on record were randomly selected to be visited.

Once a school was selected, the principal was notified by telephone of the fact and given the details of the two-day visit. To expedite this visit, arrangements were made with the principal for a staff member to come to the school and select the classes to be observed, obtain the registers of these classes so that the sociometric data-gathering instruments could be prepared, and discuss any logistical problems such as clearing rooms for the interviews with the children. It is important to note that classes to be observed were selected by project staff, in all instances. This selection was made in terms of a simple procedure: the staff member obtained the number of OE children in each class in the third, fourth, fifth and sixth grade. He was instructed to select one class at each grade which was average in proportion of OE children. Then he was to select a fifth class at the fourth, fifth or sixth grade which exemplified a different proportion of OE children than the four classes already selected. Thus if the four classes selected were all one-third OE and two-thirds resident, the staff member might select a fourth grade class which was 10% OE and 90% resident. These five classes were the basic unit for the two-day visit: they were observed, their teachers interviewed, OE and resident children interviewed, record cards analyzed, and sociometric and behavioral ratings forms completed. A total of 223 classes was selected in this way.

If there was a class or classes at the fourth, fifth or sixth grade with no OE children, one such class was selected as well. This sixth class received the sociometric and behavioral ratings forms only, to provide some comparative data on class patterns. In all, 7 such classes were selected: 2 at the fifth and 5 at the sixth grade.

Table 1 summarizes the number of classes selected, by grade and proportion OE.

Table 1

Number of Classes Studied, by Grade and Proportion OE

	Grade				Total	
Proportion OE	3	4	5	6	No.	Per cent
None			2	5	7	3
Less than 10%	7	11	18	12	48	21
10% to 25%	25	20	29	22	96	42
26% to 50%	12	21	18	23	74	32
Over 50%	1	1	1	2	5	2
TOTAL	45	53	68	64	230	

In terms of numbers of children, there are two basic numbers to be considered. One is the number of children who completed the sociometric instruments. The second is the number for whom record card data were obtained. Table 2, below, presents these data.

Table 2

Number of Children Studied, by Locale, Sex, and Grade, by Type of Data

	Sociometric and Behavioral Data				Complete Record Card Data			
	OE		Resident		OE		Resident	
Grade	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
3	48	44	195	168	120	100	111	93
4	115	120	462	396	137	142	127	136
5	164	184	763	682	165	150	150	149
6	167	177	595	631	74	53	51	50
Total	494	525	2015	1877	496	445	439	428

Design of Phase Two: Sending Schools

The design of the second phase of the study was to visit a sample of the schools which sent children to the receiving schools already studied to obtain the group paper and pencil sociometric and behavioral rating data and the clerical data. At this point in the life of the study, it was mid-June, and this was considered too late to obtain observational and interview data from the sending schools.

The lateness of this phase of the study also affected the selection of sending schools. Three receiving schools were randomly selected from those studied in each of the boroughs of Queens, Brooklyn, and the Bronx, and 5 from the receiving schools studied in Manhattan and all of the schools which sent children to those receiving schools were identified and located on a map.

Then clusters of sending schools were asked to participate so that graduate assistants and clerical staff had minimum travel time and could cover two sending schools a day. A total of 25 sending schools was selected; 7 in Manhattan, 1 in the Bronx, 12 in Brooklyn and 5 in Queens. In this way, a sample of 1052 children in the sending schools was tested with the sociometric and behavioral instruments. In addition, record data were obtained for a sample of 278 children. This sample was obtained by a matched pair technique in which a child who remained in the sending school was matched to one of the OE children from this same school. They were matched in terms of sex, age and reading grade at the time the OE child left the sending school to participate in the OE program. This sample of children in the sending schools will be referred to as the matched sample. Table 3, below, summarizes the number of children in the sending schools about whom data were obtained.

Table 3

Number of Children Studied in Sending Schools, by Type of Data, Grade and Sex

	Sociometric and Behavioral Rating Data		Record Card Data - Matched Sample	
Grade	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
3	9	16	43	29
4	181	205	44	66
5	184	225	37	59
6	98	134	0	0
Total	472	580	124	154

Procedure:

The basic data collection unit for the study in the receiving schools was the two-day visit to each participating school by a four-person team, consisting of two professionals (one an educator, the other a social scientist), one graduate assistant and one clerk. The basic design for this visit appears in Figure 1 . In brief, the observers visited two classes independently for a total of four classes and visited a fifth class simultaneously. However, they completed observational forms for this fifth class independently, so that the reliability data discussed later are based on these joint observations.

In addition to the classroom observations, the professional members of the team conducted a joint interview with the principal, independent interviews with the teachers of the classes they observed, and with remedial and guidance staff. They were also instructed to observe and report on school facilities such as lunch facilities for children and teachers, auditorium, gymnasium, playground, etc. Finally, each day, one of the observers took a bus from the school with the children, and reported on conditions aboard the bus.

At times other than when a class was being observed, the graduate assistant administered group sociometric and class rating forms to the children. During the two days, the clerk transcribed data from the record cards of all OE children in the classes selected, and also from a sample of resident children, selected alphabetically from these same classes and matched to the sample of OE children by sex.

Bases for Evaluation:

The study was intended to evaluate the program in terms of several separate dynamics:

1) Expert judgment as to the quality of instruction: obtained by sending a team of two observers into the classrooms of participating schools to observe lessons and classroom functioning. Each team of observers consisted of one educator and one social scientist. The educators were all faculty of local colleges and universities with experience in teacher training and specifically in the supervision of student teachers. Eighteen different educators participated as observers, and saw a total of 108 classes.[1] Within these classes 133 separate lessons were observed and rated.

The social scientists were psychologists and sociologists on the faculties of local colleges and universities. A total of 16 different social scientists participated in this phase of the project. With few exceptions they had previous experience in school surveys and studies, and 14 of the 16 were on the faculties of schools or departments of education. The social scientists saw 121 classes in the 38 participating schools,[1] and rated 150 separate lessons.

2) Expert judgment as to the nature of the interactions in the classroom: obtained by having the observers rate specific aspects of classroom functioning.

3) Expert judgment as to teacher behavior and functioning: obtained by having observers rate teacher behavior in terms of the Ryans checklist, a standardized 19 characteristic list of teacher behavior.[2]

4) Effects of the program on administrative and teaching staffs and their opinions about the program: obtained through face-to-face interviews by the

---

[1] This total of 229 classes includes 37 seen by both an educator and a social scientist. Thus 192 different classes were seen of the 230 selected for study. 7 were not observed because they had no OE children, and 31 classes were not observed because of scheduling difficulties.

[2] Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D. C. American Council on Education. 1960.

observer team of the educator and social scientist. Interviews were conducted with:

a) the principal, who was jointly interviewed by the observer team. Thirty-eight principals were interviewed;

b) remedial teaching and guidance staff, who were interviewed by one member of the observer team. A total of 72 such staff were interviewed, consisting specifically of 20 remedial reading teachers, 22 other remedial teachers, and 30 guidance counselors;

c) classroom teachers. Teachers were selected for interview if their classes had been selected to be observed. They were interviewed at some point during the two-day visit after their classes had been observed. The interview was conducted by that member of the observer team who had seen the class, or by one of the observers when both had seen a class. A total of 178 teachers were interviewed, consisting of 32 third grade, 45 fourth grade, 52 fifth grade, and 49 sixth grade teachers.

5) Effects of the program on the children, their reactions to and opinions about the program: obtained through face-to-face interviews of OE and resident children randomly selected by the observers from each class they observed, and individually interviewed. A total of 517 OE and 636 resident children were interviewed, with Table 4, below, presenting the breakdown by grade and sex.

Table 4

Number of Children Interviewed by Locale, Grade and Sex

	Open Enrollment		Resident	
Grade	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
3	55	44	62	51
4	62	69	92	71
5	80	70	108	84
6	60	67	90	78
Total	267	250	352	284

6) Opinions about value of program and wisdom of continuing it: obtained by direct questions asked of OE and resident children, principal, teachers, and observers themselves. (Same numbers as interviewed.)

7) Children's perception of their class and school: obtained through the paper and pencil inventories asking the child to respond to a variety of statements about his class, classmates, the school and school staff. The instrument "My Class" was completed by 1140 OE children and 4108 resident children in the receiving schools and 1052 children in the sending schools. The instrument "My School" was completed by 348 OE children and 1379 children in the receiving schools, and 1054 children in the sending schools.

8) Friendship patterns within the classroom: obtained through the administration of "Picking Friends", an instrument through which a child indicates the specific children he considers his "very good friends," his "good friends," children who are "okay," and children he "doesn't know well

enough to rate." We did not use the fifth option on this instrument in which the child indicates those children he "does not like." Since he indicates this by filling in a number 5 next to any child whose name he has not previously numbered, we chose to leave the space blank and have it filled in by our clerical staff, and so avoid having any child label another as one he did not like. This instrument was administered to 14 third grade, 38 fourth grade, 59 fifth grade and 50 sixth grade classes in the receiving schools only.

9) Socialization beyond the classroom: obtained by having observers visit lunchrooms, playgrounds and general area surrounding the school, and rating the nature of the interactions observed.

10) Physical facilities of school: obtained through observer ratings of school facilities.

11) Aspirational level of self and others: obtained by asking children to indicate by name those of their classmates (and/or self) who they think will achieve varied educational and occupational levels. (Same number of classes as on Item 8.)

12) Impact of open enrollment on attendance: estimated from attendance records during 1965-66 school year of OE, resident, and sending school children. In addition, for children for whom 1965-66 was their first year of open enrollment, their attendance in 1965-66 was compared to their attendance in 1964-65.

13) Impact on reading achievement: estimated from the distribution of reading grades in fall and spring, analysis of extent of growth by child, and the relative growth of OE and matched sample children in the sending schools.

14) Quality of Bussing Service: obtained by having observers ride the bus from school each day and rating the promptness and convenience of the service as well as the extent to which reasonable discipline was maintained.

15) Socio-educational description of participants in OE: obtained by using data available from cumulative record for OE, resident and matched sample children.

Instruments Used

To implement the study, 12 different instruments were used;[1] seven were completed by the observers, four by the children, and one by the clerical staff.

The observers completed the following instruments:

1) An interview guide for each staff person interviewed.[2] Although separate interview guides were provided for the interviews with the principal, classroom teacher, remedial teacher and guidance counselor, these guides had a large common core of questions supplemented by sets of questions specific to the roles of the particular persons being interviewed.

2) An interview guide for OE and resident children.

3) A Classroom Observation Report on which the observer rated the quality of each lesson observed, and varied aspects of classroom participation.

4) A Class Rating Scale, on which the observers rated the over-all quality of instruction for the total period of their observation, covering one or more lessons.

---

[1] Copies of all instruments appear in the Appendix.

[2] We are grateful to Professor Fred Kerlinger and his staff, for making available prototypes from which these interview guides were developed.

5) A General School Report, on which the observers noted their ratings of school and bussing facilities.

6) A Teacher Behavior Scale, on which observers rated 19 different aspects of teacher in-class personality and behavior.

7) A subjective report completed a few days after each visit, on which the observers indicated their own opinions about the program's functioning.

The children completed four instruments:

8) "My Class" - a listing of 20 descriptive statements about their class and classmates with which the children agreed or disagreed. Ten of the statements were positive and ten negative. In addition to the response pattern to each separate item, the instrument yields a total score expressing the general orientation of the child on this positive-negative continuum.

9) "My School" - a similar listing of 17 statements about school and school staff. This instrument yields an item response pattern only.

10) A Sociometric Inventory, a "Guess Who" instrument, in which children were provided with lists of the names of their classmates and asked to circle those children who fit varied behavioral statements.

11) An Aspiration Inventory, also a "Guess Who" type of inventory in which children were asked to circle the names of their classmates who would achieve certain educational and vocational levels.

The clerical staff completed one form:

12) Summary of Cumulative Record Card. Specifically, they transcribed data about:

a) Family: with whom resides.

b) Place of birth of mother, father, child.

c) Height and weight.

d) Number of schools attended.

e) Attendance for '64-'65.

f) Comparison of attendance: (Sending) '63-'64, (Receiving) '64-'65.

g) Subject performance: excellents and unsatisfactories (by grade).

h) Reading scores.

i) Math scores.

j) I.Q.

k) Teachers' comments on non-conforming test results.

l) Guidance data: unsatisfactories (by grade).

m) Special abilities and disabilities.

Briefing of Staff:

All personnel sent into the schools attended a briefing session at which they were told the purposes of the project and the functions and limits of their roles. They were also given specific instruction in the use of the instruments they would administer or handle. Because of the need to implement the project quickly, these briefings were necessarily limited and would not be considered training sessions. This had been anticipated and so the instruments used, particularly the interview guides, had been developed to be relatively structured and specific. One of the observers in each group was designated team leader; these observers received a supplementary briefing so that they could handle on-the-spot decisions. In addition, a special telephone line was installed, available only to the teams in the schools, so that immediate communication with the project coordinator was always possible.

Analysis of Data

Three major techniques were used in the analysis of the data. First, data from "My Class" and "My School" were processed by automatic tabulating equipment. Data for all other forms were tabulated by hand, since there was insufficient time to prepare these properly for punching and machine tabulation. Throughout this hand tallying, periodic spot checking was done to verify accuracy and randomly selected tallies were completely re-done as a further verification. All of these checks supported the accuracy of the tallying. Finally, the free response data obtained in the interviews and from the observers were analyzed through an a posteriori content analysis in which categories were developed by scanning the actual data. Responses were then categorized and frequency distributions obtained.

Reliability of Observer Data

The design of the study permitted three separate estimates of the reliability of the observer data. The most severe test came on the Teacher Behavior Scale where observers, using a 7-point scale, had to rate the teacher they had just seen on 19 different characteristics. Observers generally used it as a 6-point scale, avoiding the extreme negative option. But they did use all other points, so that the reliability data are not contaminated either by an avoidance of rating or an excessive use of the middle or neutral point. Complete independent observations are available for 21 different teachers and of 361 pairs of ratings, 76-4% were identical or within 1 scale point (35.2% identical, 41.2% within 1 point). Of the other 23.6% most (18.3%) were 2 scale points apart with only 5.3% of the ratings 3 points apart.

A second check on reliability is available from the Class Rating Scale, where the observers independently rated several aspects of classroom performance and functioning. Available from 36 classes, of 408 pairs of ratings, 90.6% were identical or within 1 scale unit (63.2% identical and 27.4% within 1 scale point). Finally, 144 pairs of ratings are available of the quality of instruction in the classes observed, rated on a 5-point scale. Of these, 96.4% were identical or within 1 scale point (57.6% identical, 38.8% within 1 point).

All three aspects of this analysis therefore support the reliability of the observer ratings.

In addition to these checks on reliability, the distribution of ratings of educators and social scientists for each variable were compared. Other than in isolated instances, they did not differ and so in the overview which follows they are combined for ease of communication.

A final introductory piece of information on the observations is the observers' feelings as to the typicality of the lessons they observed. Almost all (91%), were rated either as "completely typical" (47%) or "a reasonable approximation" (44%). The 9% rated as "less than a reasonable approximation" amounted to 24 lessons and most were so rated because of a substitute handling the class (7) or a non-teaching lesson being observed (8).

Presentation of Data

In the report which follows the attempt has been made to present the maximum amount of data within a relatively small report. To accomplish this, each of the 15 bases for evaluation noted above will be considered in turn and a summary paragraph will be presented followed by the specific findings from which it was derived. Because of the varied instruments used, this listing of specific findings will also indicate the source of each particular piece of data being presented.

Following the data for the 15 aspects, an over-all summary will be presented of the entire project. Concluding the report are the final comments of the Research Director, including a consideration of the limitations of the project.

Throughout the presentation of results, major attention has been paid to practical, rather than statistical, significance. With the numbers of children involved in this study, small differences in degree within the same quality response will be statistically significant. These have been noted, but where, despite statistically significant differences, the response pattern was essentially parallel for the samples studied, this has been noted as well.

RESULTS

1. Ratings of Quality of Instruction

About one-third of the observers thought that the caliber of instruction they observed was "above average" or "excellent" and another two-fifths rated it as "average." This was true both of their ratings of the quality of instruction of the total class period they observed and their ratings of the quality of specific lessons within that class period. Thus, at least 72%, and as many as 81% of these ratings of quality were "average" or above, with at least 23% and as many as 44% "above average" or "excellent."

In keeping with this consistently positive evaluation of the quality of instruction, the observers were positive in their evaluation of the total program when asked to assume that the quality of instruction as seen was typical. When asked to "role play" a bit, first as a parent of an OE child and then as a parent of a resident child, in both instances, a majority of the observers said they would be enthusiastic or positive about having their child in the class.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Quality of Instruction: by class	3% of classes observed were rated outstanding, 34% as better than average, 42% as average and 17% as poor and 4% as extremely poor. (37:42:21)[1]	Observer Class Rating Scale
b) Quality of Instruction: by lesson	Of 283 separate lessons observed,[2] 9% were rated excellent, 25% above average, 44% average, 18% poor and 4% very poor. (34:44:22)	OCRS
c) Quality of Reading Lessons Observed	Of 54 reading lessons, 4% were rated excellent, 29% better than average, 39% average, 24% poor, 4% very poor. (33:39:28)	OCRS

---

[1] These numbers summarize the proportions above average, average, and below average respectively.

[2] Two hundred sixty three of these lessons are discussed in items "c" through "g" below. The other twenty involved committee work, assembly programs, research, or instruction in Fine Arts.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
d) Quality of Language Arts Lessons (other than reading) observed	Of 43 lessons, 23% were rated above average, 58% average, 14% poor and 5% extremely poor (23:58:19)	Observer Class Rating Scale
e) Quality of Arithmetic Lessons Observed	Of 102 Arithmetic lessons, 6% were rated excellent, 29% better than average, 40% average, 22% poor and 3% as very poor (35:40:25)	OCRS
f) Quality of Social Studies Lessons Observed	Of 50 social studies lessons, 12% were rated excellent, 32% better than average, 39% as average, 14% as poor and 4% as very poor (44:39:18)	OCRS
g) Quality of Science Lessons Observed	Of 14 science lessons, 22% were rated excellent, 14% better than average, 43% as average, 14% as poor and 7% as very poor (36:43:21)	OCRS
h) Observers' Feelings About Class If Quality of Instruction Observed were Typical and Observer were OE Parent	23% enthusiastic, 42% slightly positive, 22% slightly negative, 13% strongly negative	OCRS
i) Observers' Feelings About Class if Quality of Instruction Observed were Typical and Observer were Resident Parent	20% enthusiastic, 39% slightly positive, 26% slightly negative and 15% strongly negative	OCRS
j) Relationship of Observers' Feelings as Resident and OE Parent	84% of ratings identical, 12% were more positive as parent of OE child, 4% more positive as parent of resident child	OCRS
k) Observers' Feelings About OE Program if Quality of Instruction Observed was Typical	58% said "retain as is," 36% said "modify," 6% said "abolish." Basically, observers who would "modify" pointed to grouping or provision of individual attention particularly re anxiety and language problems of OE children. They also noted need for better calibre instructional techniques and better teacher-pupil interaction. In all but one instance, those observers who said "abolish" said so because they had seen what they considered poor teaching. In the one exception, the observer believed the classroom was segregated in seating and spirit.	OCRS

2. Interaction in Classroom

In ratings of what happened in the classrooms during the lessons they observed, about three fourths of both educators and social scientists agreed that the OE children were indistinguishable[1] from the resident children in terms of seating patterns and such functional criteria as class participation, volunteering and being called on by the teacher. In the other fourth of the instances, the observers felt that even if they had not known some children were being "bussed in," they would have been aware that some children were not an integral part of the class, either because of clustered seating or limited participation.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Observer Awareness of Children Being Bussed In if They had not known it.	82% "not at all" aware, 15% "slightly," 3% "definitely" aware some children being bussed in.	Observers Classroom Observation Report
Why Observers Were Aware of Children Being Bussed (40 slightly aware, 9 definitely)	Most often because of limited participation by OE children or because of seating patterns in classroom.	
b) Seating of OE children in Classroom	62% of classes were rated as having OE children "thoroughly dispersed," 22% somewhat clustered," 16% "clustered."	OCOR
c) Extent of Class Participation	3% rated OE children with more participation than residents, 70% the same, and 27% participated less than resident children. (73:27)[2]	OCRS

---

[1] All of the data presented in this section are based on the more than 90% of classes observed in which the resident children were white and the OE children Negro and Puerto Rican. Those classes with Negro residents were necessarily excluded from these ratings as in these classes the observers could not distinguish resident and OE children.

[2] In this section, the numbers in parenthesis summarize the proportion of ratings where OE children were rated the same or more and rated as less, respectively.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
d) Spntaneous Questioning	4% rated as more questioning by OE children, 70% rated same and 26% less or none by OE children (74:26)	OCOR
e) Called on by Teacher	6% rated as having OE children called on more, 75% same, 14% less, and 5% almost none for OE children (8:19)	OCOR
f) Volunteering	3% rated as more volunteering by OE children, 62% same, and 35% less or no volunteering by OE children (65:35)	OCOR
g) In Working, i.e., in workbooks	3% rated as OE working more, 81% same, 16% less or no working by OE children (84:16)	OCOR

3. Teacher Behavior

At the close of the observation period the observers were asked to rate the teachers' in-class personality and behavior using the 19 dichotomous variables on the Ryans scale, spelled out in Table 5 below. Ratings of educators and social scientists did not differ in any consistent way on this scale and so they are combined in the table. Observers were instructed to indicate any instance in which they felt that the teacher behaved differently towards the OE and resident children. They made such an indication in less than 1 o/o (.6 o/o) of their ratings and so these data suggest that teachers behaved the same way towards both groups of children.

Now as to how they behaved. The observers felt they had seen at least balanced and often positive teacher behavior, particularly in the third grade classes observed. On the 19 different aspects of teacher in-class behavior covering functional and interpersonal characteristics, in all grades (3, 4, 5, 6), the median teacher received negative ratings on only one characteristic "stereotyped use of routines" versus "original imaginative teaching". Depending on her grade, she received average ratings on three to eight characteristics and positive ratings on ten (5th grade to sixteen (3rd grade). The table below gives the composite data for all grades.[1]

For four characteristics more than 75 o/o of the observers rated teachers at the positive end of the scale being: 1) attractively groomed; 2) steady, calm and stable; 3) responsible, conscientious, and setting standards, and 4) confident and sure of self. No negative characteristic was attributed to this large a proportion, and thus these four were the characteristics which most completely characterized the teachers observed.

---

[1] The table presents an average of percents for the separate grades, so that each grade accounts for one-fourth of these averages.

Table 5

Proportion of Teachers Receiving Below Average, Average and Above Average Ratings on Characteristics of Ryans' Checklist, All Grades Combined

	Proportion of Teachers Rated As		
Characteristic	Positive	Balanced	Negative
1. Unattractive - Attractive	82	13	5
2. Erratic - Steady	82	9	9
3. Evading - Responsible	79	11	10
4. Uncertain - Confident	75	15	10
5. Inarticulate - Fluent	70	16	14
6. Excitable - Poised	70	23	7
7. Partial - Fair	66	23	11
8. Disorganized - Systematic	63	21	16
9. Apathetic - Alert	62	15	23
10. Immature - Integrated	60	28	12
11. Aloof - Responsive	56	19	25
12. Harsh - Kindly	51	33	16
13. Unsympathetic - Understanding	49	32	19
14. Pessimistic - Optimistic	46	33	19
15. Narrow - Broad	44	30	26
16. Inflexible - Adaptable	42	25	33
17. Dull - Stimulating	42	26	32
18. Autocratic - Democratic	36	23	41
19. Stereotyped - Original	27	22	51

4. Effect of Program on Administrative and Teaching Staff and Their Opinions About It

Principals and guidance counselors and, to a lesser extent, classroom and remedial teachers agreed that since the introduction of the OE programs into their school their jobs had become more difficult, with problems they had not faced before. Questioned in specific areas, a majority of each staff level noted increased disciplinary problems, half or more noted alterations in methods of instruction (although half of the teachers said there had been none), and half of the teachers felt there had been a decline in the school's level of achievement since the introduction of OE whereas the other half said it had stayed the same or even improved. Referring only to the OE children, a heavy majority of teachers felt that their level of achievement had increased since they entered the receiving school.

Teachers and principals noted similar areas of weakness in the program, and similar contributions of the program. Primary contributions were in the area of ethnic interaction and consequent improved understanding and relationships among the children, often stated as providing an opportunity for each group of children to learn about the other's "way of life." The improved education and aspiration of the OE children was also cited with principals adding references to professional growth of teachers and improved teaching materials. The weaknesses cited were largely administrative considerations which teachers and/or principals felt had been neglected. Most often mentioned were lack of supervision on the bus, lack of orientation of teachers, children or parents, what was referred to as lack of screening in the sending schools, overcrowding and/or insufficient personnel and facilities in the receiving schools, difficulties in contacting parents of OE children, and finally teachers' feelings that no provision had been made for the OE children to participate in the after-school activities in the receiving school.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Effect of OE program on discipline in school	At least 60% of each staff level interviewed said "yes" the OE program had made for more discipline problems. The highest proportion of "yes" came from the guidance counselors (85%) and principals (82%), with smaller proportions of classroom (67%) and remedial teachers (67%) saying so.	Observers Interviews of Staff
a1) What changes in discipline were necessary	Those who said there had been changes, referred most often in general terms to the need for "constant discipline" or to some specific procedure they have implemented such as "being firmer" or allowing less talk. A few cited some specific behavior of OE children which they felt had not been a problem before, i.e., aggression or obscenity. Then, of course, 20% to 30% reiterated their belief that there had been no change.	OIS
b) Effect of OE program on method of instruction	Asked if there had been changes in methods of instruction, principals (70%) and guidance counselors (75%) believed there had been in far larger proportions than classroom (48%) or remedial teachers (45%).	OIS
b1) What changes in instruction did classroom teachers report (N=80)	Teachers who did specify a change or changes in methods of instruction reported several with similar frequencies 1) slowing pace or lowering level (10) particularly in reading 2) more individualized instruction (8) 3) greater emphasis on discipline (7). They also noted changes in their own attitudes (4), i.e., requiring more patience, encouragement or in the need to "work hard" (5). Otherwise they referred to specific techniques used like audio-visual materials (4) or more homework (4). 4) reviewing or reteaching fundamentals (5).	
b2) What changes in instruction did remedial teachers report (N=19)	Remedial teachers who reported changes primarily noted that the "change" was the remedial program itself (10), i.e., it had been introduced since the OE program began. Otherwise they cited individual changes they had made in regard to organization, materials or techniques.	
c) Effect of OE program on Guidance Services (N=30)	In six schools the guidance program had been implemented since the OE program began. In schools with a program prior to OE, 70% said there had been modifications, almost all of which can be summed up in the category "more guidance services." Other than this, a few (3) referred to getting parents and staff involved in their program.	Observers Interview Guidance Counselor

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
d) Teacher's Estimate of Changes in Level of Achievement Since OE (N=178)	Teachers responded to this question either in terms of OE children or resident children or "school before OE." When referring to OE children 76% of teachers felt there had been an increase in level of achievement, 5% saw no change, and 19% reported OE were achieving little or less. Referring to resident children or the school level of achievement before OE, 18% of the teachers reported greater achievement, 32% the same and 50% a decline in achievement.	Observers Teacher Interview
e) Principal's Perception of Effects of OE on His Job (N=38)	23 Principals noted their job was now "substantially" (15) "moderately" (7) or "slightly" (1) more difficult with 5 reporting it "about the same," 9 reporting it "better" and 1 not answering.	Observers Principal Interview
e1) Why More Difficult (N=23)	Specific difficulties were less time for supervision and teacher training (9), more discipline problems (8), more clerical and scheduling problems (10), and more problems with parents (8)	OPI
e2) Why Better (N=9)	Job was seen as better because of satisfaction from seeing improvement of OE children (3), increased social awareness (3) or professional growth (3) by the principal.	OPI
f) Principal's Perception of Weakness of Program (N=38)	Every principal cited at least 1 weakness. Most often they noted bussing (21) with lack of supervision, the length of the trip and the early start. Next they referred to problems of screening (11), to insufficient personnel (8), difficulties of contact with OE parents (5) and the general area of orientation (10) with specific references to teachers (3), OE parents (3), OE children (3) and resident parents (1).	OPI
g) Principal's Perception of Contributions of Program (N=38)	35 of 38 principals cited at least one contribution. Most often (26), these involved Negro-white interaction and/or the social values and understandings as a consequence of this. Then they cited the higher achievement and better education for OE children (11), professional growth of teachers (4), improved methods particularly re: history of minorities (3) and raising aspirations of OE children (3).	OPI
h) Teacher's Perceptions of Contributions of Program (N=178)	One hundred fifty of the teachers named at least one contribution. Almost all (139) cited ethnic integration, referring specifically to wider social contacts and increased social awareness among children (48), the exposure to each other's way of life (40) or to general improved ethnic relationships (30). Then they mentioned the improved educational opportunities and/or aspirations of OE children (52) and the removal of OE children to a "better environment (12).	Observers Teacher Interview

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
i) Teacher's Perceptions of Weaknesses of Program	All teachers cited at least one weakness. Most often (51) they referred to problems involved with bussing, including lack of supervision, length of trip and scheduling problems. Then they mentioned screening problems (36) either their perception that only "problem children" were sent (22) or that there was insufficient limiting of the program to the academically most able (14). Then there was a cluster of weaknesses mentioned by between 18 and 25 teachers: the limited opportunities CE children had for participation in after-school activities (25), the difficulties the school had in contacting CE parents (23), overcrowding and/or inadequate facilities in the receiving school (20) and what teacher perceived as continued segregation within the program (18), i.e., on busses, in grouping in class or most often, voluntarily by the CE children (10).	OTI

5. Effects of Program on Children and Their Opinions About It

A majority of both resident and OE children liked the program and thought it was a good idea, although there were large differences in the majorities: 70% of residents compared to 90% of OE children. The resident children who did not like the program believed that the school had changed for the worse since the program in terms of criteria like more fighting, noise, destruction of property or impeded learning opportunities. Those resident children who thought it was a good idea referred to the general idea that through the program the OE children were attending a better, less crowded school and so would obtain a better education, and that through interacting in the program they (the residents) and OE children each got to know different kinds of people.

The OE children preferred the receiving school because of less fighting, their liking for children and staff and the quality of the teaching and physical facilities, all of which added up to their learning more than they learned in the sending schools. They spelled out, in other questions, the instruction in specific subjects and better teaching which they felt was the basis for their learning more.

School staff had an accurate perception of the children's feelings, nothing that the OE children were more fully in favor of the program than the resident children, although staff said that a majority of both groups favored it.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Resident Children's Feelings as to Whether School Has Changed Since OE Program Instituted	Of 542 resident children, 48% said school has changed, 49% said it had not, and 3% couldn't say.	Observers Interviews Resident Children
a1) What Resident Children Think Has Changed	Among those 259 resident children who did feel that the school had changed, 75% noted a change considered negative, 24% referred to neutral changes, and 1% to changes considered positive. Most often the negative changes involved less controlled discipline, more fighting or more trouble (67 times), less effective learning or disrupted classes (24), crowded conditions (23) noise (15) and destruction of school property (13). The neutral changes most often involved references like "new teachers," "new programs" or "more Negro children attend now."	OIRC
b) Resident Children's Feelings as to Whether OE Program Was a Good Idea	70% think it was, 23% think it was a bad idea, 7% neutral	OIRC
b1) Resident Children's Perception of Why OE Children Come	Almost all because this (receiving) school is a good school, a better school, less crowded or because they (OE children) want a better education	OIRC
b2) Why Resident Children Thought it a Good Idea (N=326)	Most gave only a generalization (116). Where a reason was stated, most often it referred to getting to know different people (59), helping OE children get better education (37), or go to a better school (24).	OIRC
b3) Why Resident Children Thought it a Bad Idea (N=108)	Most often they referred to fighting or behavior problems (31), then to issue of going to school where "they" (OE) live (22) or to difficulties of travel or getting sick (17) and then to bad academic consequences on the resident children or level of instruction (10).	OIRC
c) OE Children's Feelings About the Program	90% of OE children prefer the receiving school, 9% prefer the sending school and 1% had no preference	Observers Interviews OE Children
c1) Why OE Children Preferred Receiving School (N=430)	There were five major areas of response: School atmosphere re: better discipline and fewer fights (93), or re: liking of children and staff (54); quality of staff re: better teachers (77), physical facilities of school (79) or the fact of their learning more (68).	OIOEC

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
c2) OE Children's References to Integration	Only 2 of 430 reasons for preferring the receiving school referred to integration *per se*.	OIOEC
c3) Why OE Children Prefer Old (Sending) School (N=47)	Most frequently referred to travel and bussing (7), familiarity of old school and teachers (8), fights in new school (6), or general reference to old school "better" (8). Of 481 interviews only 3 referred to being insulted or picked on in receiving school.	OIOEC
d) Things OE Children Do at Receiving School They Didn't Do at Sending School	70% of the OE children did specify something they did at receiving school which they did not do at sending school. Primarily these involved instruction in specific subjects like Art (31), Home Economics (20), Math (17), Music (16) or Science (11). They also referred to specific school facilities like gymnasium (55), yard (12) or library (11), and one cluster referred to the higher level of responsibility they had (21), i.e., as monitors.	OIOEC
e) OE Children's Perception of Receiving Special Help at Receiving School	About half (47) of the OE children interviewed specified some special help they received. Most often they specified that teachers "teach more in class" (84), then they referred to special reading classes (63). No other special help was mentioned by more than 7 children.	OIOEC
f) Do OE Children like the Receiving School	In addition to being asked which school they preferred, the OE children were asked if they "liked it here." 91% said they did like it, with 8% saying they liked the sending school better, and 1% saying they liked both schools. Asked why, most were relatively noncommittal, simply saying that they liked it "OK" and wanted to stay.	OIOEC
g) Staff Perceptions of White Resident Children's Opinions of Program	At each staff level, about two-thirds believed the resident children were "mildly" or "strongly" accepting of program. Only 10% believe resident children were "mildly rejecting" of program and only a few teachers (6) or principals (4) believed there was any "strong rejection" by resident children.	Observers Interviews of Staff
h) Staff Perceptions of OE Children's Opinion of Program	At each staff level almost all believed OE children were "strongly" or "mildly" accepting of the program (62% to 74%).	OIS

6. Staff's Opinions About Continuing the OE Program

At each of the four staff levels studied: principal, classroom teacher, remedial teacher and guidance counselor, about two-thirds were in favor of OE, and said "continue the program with modifications." Of the other third, for principals and teachers, 20% said continue "as is" and 10% said "abolish." For guidance counselors, 10% said continue "as is" and 20% said "abolish," and for remedial teachers, 15% each said continue "as is" and "abolish."

Most modifications suggested were administrative procedures intended to smooth the operation of the program, i.e., better orientation, supervision on the bus, better screening. Less often they noted the need for improved teacher training and/or new techniques, methods and materials.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Staff Opinions of OE Program	At each staff level about two-thirds were "strongly" or "mildly" favorable (53% to 69%), and one-third "mildly" or "strongly" unfavorable, primarily "mildly."	Observers Staff Interviews
b) Principal's Opinion on Continuing the Program	21% said continue it "as is", 72% said "continue it with modifications" and 7% said "abolish it."	Observers Principal Interviews
b1) Modifications Suggested by Principals (N=38)	1. Better screening of OE children (12) 2. Give receiving schools additional services and/or personnel (14) 3. Begin in lower grades only (9) 4. Better orientation of OE parents (6) or children (2) 5. Better coordination between sending and receiving schools (4) and/or headquarters (4) 6. Provide supervision on bus and/or improved service (7) 7. Provide teacher training and orientation (4)	
c) Teachers' Opinion on Continuing the Program	23% said continue "as is" 65% said "modify" and 12% said "abolish."	Observers Teacher Interviews
c1) Modifications Suggested by Teachers (N=196)[1]	Most often teachers referred to better screening (41), beginning in lower grades (13), eliminating discipline problems from program (14), the need for new techniques, methods or materials (20), supervision on busses or shorter trips (24), cooperation with or orientation of OE parents (25). A cluster of teachers (12) noted that modifications also involved societal changes re: housing.	

[1] Some teachers gave more than one suggestion.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
d) Guidance Counselors' Opinion on Continuing Program	13% said continue "as is," 65% said "modify" and 22% said "abolish it."	Observers Guidance Counselor Interviews
d1) Modifications Suggested by Guidance Counselors (N=30).	Most often guidance counselors suggested improved bus service (14) including supervision, extended service after regular school hours and shorter trips; more special services or additional personnel in receiving school (9), better screening (5), orientation of OE parents (4) and more teacher training and orientation (4).	
e) Remedial Teachers' Opinion on Continuing the Program	15% said continue "as is," 66% said "continue with modifications," 17% said "abolish it."	Observers Remedial Teacher Interviews
e1) Modifications Suggested by Remedial Teachers (N=42)	The modifications suggested by remedial teachers were identical to those suggested by guidance counselors: improved bussing service (10), better screening (8), additional services and personnel in receiving school (7), orientation of OE parents (and children) (6). A few (2 or 3) referred to specific aspects of remedial instruction like an intensive reading program for OE children.	

7. Children's Perceptions of School, Staff, and Classmates

Asked to react to 17 aspects of school and staff, OE and resident children gave the same response pattern to 16 aspects, that is they had the same majority response. Only on item 14 for boys and item 11 for girls did the majority response differ. Thus, when 9 items are listed below on which there was a difference of at least 6%, it should be noted that these are differences of degree within the same quality response. Moreover, while on each of these 9 items the difference was one in which smaller proportions of OE than resident children gave the "positive" response, in 6 of the 9 items larger proportions of OE than matched sample children in the sending schools gave the positive response. For example, note item 15 on too much fighting, or item 14 on whether this is "the best school I know" or item 9 on the pleasantness of the school building.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Perception of School and Staff	I - No differences in proportion of OE or resident children who said: 1) Teachers want to help (99:98:96)[1] 2) Teachers really interested (85:84:82) 3) Teachers explain clearly (91:91:89) 4) Good lunches (46:43:44 Yes) (48:40:50 No) 5) What they are learning is useful (91:92:91) 6) Don't wish didn't go to school (65:68:69) 7) Learned more this year than before (81:79:78) 8) Work not too easy (69:68:61) II - OE and resident children differed at least 6% in proportion who said "yes" to: 9) School building pleasant (Boys 68:74:58) (Girls 75:77:61) 10) Work isn't too hard (78:84:78) 11) Deny work hard and get nowhere (Boys 57:63:56) (Girls 45:70:51) 12) Teachers don't expect you to work too hard (55:63:44)	"My School"

---

[1] In this area, the numbers in parentheses are the proportions giving the indicated response for OE, resident and sending school children respectively. Unless indicated, the per cents are for both sexes combined, since they were combined when they did not differ.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
	13) Teachers fair and square (Boys 69:78:65) (Girls 78:82:65)	
	14) Best school I know (Boys 46:57:33) (Girls 62:65:40)	
	15) Boys and girls fight too much (67:58:85)	
	16) Principal friendly (Boys 69:82:76) (Girls 82:87:81)	
	17) Trip to school isn't too hard (66:80:80) Trip to school is too hard (33:20:18)	

Asked to react to 20 aspects[1] of their class and classmates, the children's responses had quantitative differences of at least 6% on 10 items, and on 5 of these the difference reflected a different majority response as well. Response patterns for OE and sending school children were closer than for the Inventory on "My School."

The differences typically reflected a less positive perception of the class by OE and sending school children compared to resident children, but without a consistent theme. On some items concerned with characteristics of classmates (politeness, gratitude, hard-working) there were no differences; on others (fairness, trying something new, trustworthiness) there were. Similarly, on some aspects of class climate there were no differences (chance to show what can do, interesting) while on others (having good time, need for better classroom, or better materials) there were differences.

The two largest differences, the only ones of 15%, point up the tendency of OE children and sending school children to believe that they lack both the "things" and the "classroom" to do their best work.

---

[1] One item will be omitted here since examiners frequently reported children did not understand meaning of "many children look down on others."

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
b) Perception of Class and Classmates	I - No differences between OE and resident children who said: 1) Do interesting things in class (82:84:78)[1] 2) Children happy when you do something for them (72:76:66) 3) Good class except for one or two children (82:80:82) 4) Everyone trying to keep classroom nice (53:54:43) 5) Everyone in class wants to work hard (61:56:52) 6) Everyone has chance to show what can do (74:73:65) 7) Everyone polite (48:51:38) 8) Everyone can do good job if try (94:96:95) II - Differences of at least 6% in proportion of OE and resident children who said: 9) You can't trust almost everyone in this class (51:45:63) 10) Not hard to make friends (71:77:70) 11) Many children not fair (34:28:42) 12) Children want to try anything new (47:54:44) 13) A lot of children don't like to do things together (38:45:32) 14) Children in class not pretty mean (57:66:44) 15) Can have good time in class (74:83:78) 16) Everyone doesn't mind his own business (53:44:59) 17) Feel do belong (48:62:49) 18) Do have things needed to do best work (40:55:39) 19) Don't need better classroom to do best work (60:76:56)	"My Class"

In terms of the over-all score provided by the "My Class" instrument, all three groups had positive medians. There were no differences between receiving and OE children, but both groups were slightly more positive than children in sending schools. Equally important, in the three groups of children the proportions with over-all positive perceptions of their class (above zero) were 75% for OE children, 80% for residents and 70% for children in the sending schools.

---

[1] In this area, the numbers in parentheses are the proportions giving the indicated response for OE, resident and sending school children respectively.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
c) Over-all Perception of Class, on Positive-Negative Continuum	Table 6	"My Class"

Proportions With Indicated Over-All

Perception of Class

Quality	Score	Group		
		OE	Res.	Send.
Positive	9 -12	13	18	7
	5 - 8	35	34	29
	1 - 4	27	28	34
Balanced	0	9	6	7
Negative	1 - 4	13	11	18
	5 - 8	3	3	5
	9 -12	*	*	*
Total Positive		75	80	70
Total Negative		16	14	23
Median		+4.3	+4.8	+2.8

*There were some children with scores in this category, but too few to round to 1%.

The final aspect of perception of class which was studied were children's direct perceptions of each other. The children were given pre-printed lists of the class roster and the graduate assistant read a stimulus "guess who" item and the children circled the names of their classmates to whom it applied. Our interest was not in identifying stars or isolates but in seeing if either OE or resident children tended to stereotype themselves or each other. To this end the analysis of these data compared the responses to each item to the basic distribution of OE boys and girls in the classes studied on this instrument.[1] The analysis was done separately by sex since the immediate first finding was that among both OE and resident children (in the elementary schools at least) boys and girls cordially dislike each other and attribute positive characteristics to their own sex and negative characteristics to the opposite sex.

The basic distribution against which the item responses were tabulated was:

OE boys - 10%
OE girls - 11%
Res. boys - 42%
Res. girls - 37%

The over-all finding from these items, which essentially consisted of negatively charged behavioral descriptions, was that OE boys and girls tended to name each other more often than in the proportions above. Thus the OE children showed some tendency to state that they more often had negative characteristics than the resident children. For example, on the first item listed below, asking "who says mean things," among OE boys, 34% of their choices were other OE children compared to the 21% of the OE children actually in the classes. In contrast, resident boys and girls typically chose children almost exactly in the proportions above, and thus indicated no tendency to stereotype by group, instead saying that they felt these negative behavioral traits were distributed among themselves and the OE children to the same extent.

---

[1] This instrument was only administered in the first 31 schools studied since sufficient data were obtained by that time.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
d) Perception of Each Other's Characteristics		Sociometric Inventory
d1) Who Says Mean Things?	OE boys and girls named each other more often than expected (34% and 31% compared to 21%) and picked the residents less often. Resident boys and girls selected children almost exactly like the basic proportions in the classes	SI
d2) Who Pushes and Shoves?	OE boys and girls picked each other more often than expected (35% and 32%) and picked the residents less often. Resident boys and girls responded as the proportions in class.	SI
d3) Who is Not Sure of Self in Anything?	OE boys named more OE boys and fewer resident boys than expected. OE girls named more OE girls and fewer resident boys than expected.[1] Residents did not differ from the basic proportions.	SI
d4) Who Starts Fights Over Nothing?	OE boys and girls picked each other more often (37% and 34%). Residents no different than basic proportions.	
d5) Who Says They Can't Do Things?	OE boys and girls picked each other more often (37% and 44%). Residents no different than basic proportions.	SI
d6) Who Do You Like to Play With?	Selection was almost purely on basis of sex; i.e., OE boys selected selves (36%) and resident boys (44%) and resident boys did same (11% and 65%); so did OE (37% and 45%) and resident girls (15% and 68%).	SI
d7) Who Does Nobody Play With?	Very few children named. Of these few, OE boys named selves and OE girls similar to the basic proportions but named more resident girls and fewer resident boys. OE girls named more OE boys and fewer resident boys than the basic proportions. Residents did not differ from the basic proportions.	SI
d8) Who Takes Others' Things?	All groups chose similarly to the basic proportions except OE girls who named each other more often and resident boys less often than those proportions.	SI

---

[1] In the Findings in this section, specific results are stated only when they differ from the basic proportions, for instance in "d3" OE girls picked resident girls as expected.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
d9) Who Lies to Get Others in Trouble?	OE boys chose OE and resident girls more often than in the basic proportions and chose resident boys less. OE girls also chose OE girls (but not boys) more often and resident boys and girls less often. Resident boys and girls chose OE children as in the basic proportions but chose resident boys less often and resident girls more often.	SI
d10) Who Does Not Obey the Teacher?	OE boys and girls chose themselves more often and resident boys less often than the basic proportions. Resident boys chose resident girls more and themselves less often, and resident girls chose as in the basic proportions.	SI

8. Friendship Patterns Within the Classroom

Two independent, and quite different, aspects of the study both support the conclusion that frequent friendships have developed between OE and resident children. As with the data just discussed on characteristics attributed to each other, the friendship patterns too were predominantly between children of the same sex. The first source of data was the direct questions asked the children in the interviews, as to whether they had made "friends" with each other. Almost without exception they said they had. A more rigorous test was provided by the instrument "Picking Friends"*in which each child was provided with a class roster and asked to place a number 1 next to his "very good friends," a number 2 next to his "good" friends a 3 next to children who are "okay" and a 4 next to those he "doesn't know well enough to rate."[1]

The data from "Picking Friends" corroborates the interview data since in the large majority of classes every resident child received a 1 or 2 from at least one OE child and vice versa.

A detailed analysis of these data was also done in terms of the proportion of OE children in the class. Four gradations were used: less than 10%, 10% to 25%,

---

[1] As noted earlier in the Procedure, we did not ask the child to place a 5 next to those he "did not like." The instrument provides this final instruction, asking the child to place the 5 next to all those without a number. These 5's were added later by clerical staff.

*See end of Appendix.

26% to 45%, and 46% to 58%, which was the highest concentration of OE children. These data, presented in item "e" below, reveal two facts: the larger the proportion of OE children in the class, the more positively the OE children felt about their friendships with the resident children, but in contrast, resident children felt positively about their friendships with the OE children at each gradation.

Finally, the data from "Picking Friends" indicated no differences among OE or resident children in the extent to which they indicated they "did not know" each other or the extent to which they had no liking for each other.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Resident Children's Perception of Social Interaction Among Children (N=595)	96% of resident children interviewed reported having made friends among the bussed-in children. 46% reported having made few friends (1-5), 26% some (6-15) and 28% many (16 or more) friends.	Observers Interview Resident Children
b) OE Children's Perception of Social Interaction Among Children (N=567)	98% of OE children interviewed reported having made friends in the receiving school. 16% reported a few (1-5) friends, 24% reported some (6-15) and 60% reported many (16 or more). Of these friends 8% were made on the bus only, 29% in school only, and 63% both in school and on bus.	Observers Interview OE Children
c) OE Perception of Having Made Friends Among Residents	In 36% (for OE boys) and 25% (for OE girls) of classes, every resident child was selected as a "very good" or "good" friend by at least one OE child. In an additional third of the classes (32% for boys and 40% for girls) at least three-fourths of resident children were so rated. At the other end of the scale, in about 15% of the classes, less than one-half of the resident children were selected as "very good" or "good" friends by the OE children.	"Picking Friends"
d) Residents' Perception of Having Made Friends Among OE	In 80% of classes every OE child was selected by at least one resident child as a "very good" or "good" friend; in 17% of classes between one-half and three-fourths were so selected and in only 3% were fewer than one-half selected.	"PF"

Aspect of Evaluation	Findings	Source
e) Relationship of Friendship Patterns to Proportion of OE children in Class	As the proportion of OE children increased from less than 10 o/o to 58 o/o, friendship patterns reported differed for OE and resident children. For OE boys the proportion of classes in which at least three-fourths of the resident children were selected as "very good" or "good" friends by OE children went from 24 o/o to 62 o/o to 85 o/o to 100 o/o as the proportion of OE children went from less than 10 o/o, to 10-25 o/o, to 26-45 o/o and 45 o/o to 58 o/o. For OE girls, the same trend was noted but the large increase occurred in the 11 o/o to 25 o/o interval. The proportions were: 17 o/o, 67 o/o, 75 o/o, and 83 o/o. In contrast, for residents, the proportions of classes in which at least three-fourths of the OE children were selected as "very good" or "good" friends stayed about the same. For resident boys, these proportions were: 97 o/o, 84 o/o, 84 o/o, and 100 o/o. For resident girls they were 93 o/o, 92 o/o, 86 o/o, 83 o/o.	"PF"
f) Extent to Which Children Did Not Know Each Other	The "Picking Friends" instrument gave the child an option to indicate those children he did not "know well enough" to rate. 6 o/o of the OE children used this option for each other, and about 9 o/o used it for resident children. Similarly, about 10 o/o of the resident children used this option for OE children, but more, about 14 o/o, used it for themselves.	"PF"
g) Extent to Which Children Indicated No Liking for Each Other	The "Picking Friends" instrument provides an estimate of the extent to which children indicated no liking (and by inference, dislike) for each other. Typically, for both OE and resident boys and girls, about 20 o/o indicated this for themselves and for each other. The only deviations from this were the OE girls, where only 13 o/o indicated no liking for other OE girls, and the resident boys, where 25 o/o indicated no liking for other resident boys.	"PF"

9. Socialization Beyond the Classroom

Some of the free response data offers an insight into the observers' feelings about socialization beyond the classroom. Overall, the observers thought it was good with a general feeling of acceptance of each other by resident and OE children, leading to increased mutual understanding. They were critical, however, of lunch facilities, with their criticism stemming from their perception of the OE children being seated separately when residents were also in the lunchroom or having lunch alone because residents went home.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Seating in Lunchroom	Of 46 comments referring to seating at lunch, 76% were critical. These observers referred either in general to separate seating of OE and residents or noted specific reasons resulting in this, i.e., only OE children eat lunch in school, children receiving free lunch or "hot" lunch are seated separately, and a few to what they perceived as children sitting together with friends from the bus. The minority of positive comments simply referred to integrated or interspersed seating.	General School Report
b) Interaction in Lunchroom among Children	Of 55 comments, about half (28) were positive references to the general atmosphere of the lunchroom, the other half noted limited interaction (for all children), and a small cluster (5) to the OE children sticking together.	GSR
c) Interaction in Play Activities	Of 29 free response comments on interaction at play, 62% referred to these as integrated interactions and 38% referred to the OE and resident children playing separately.	GSR
d) Observers' Subjective feelings about success of social aspects of program	On the subjective evaluation form completed after their visits, observers were asked to evaluate the success of the "social or personal" aspects of OE. 84% thought these were successful at least partially. They referred to the understanding gained by resident and OE children of each other, to friendships, visits, and most often, to the fact that the children got along well. Those who felt OE was unsuccessful in its social and personal aspects referred to the limited mixing at lunch or play (which also troubled many observers whose overall rating was positive), the lack of opportunity for OE children to participate in after-school programs and the feeling of some observers that the program intensifies the children's feelings of segregation.	Observers' Subjective Report

10. Physical Facilities of Receiving School

Asked to rate the attractiveness of the classrooms they visited and given the chance to discuss any other facilities they observed, the observers were generally complimentary about school facilities. Six out of every seven thought classrooms average or better in attractiveness, and similarly large majorities liked facilities like the library, auditorium, gymnasium, and playground.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Attractiveness of Classroom	28% of classrooms rated above average, 59% average, 13% below average in attractiveness.	Observer Classroom Observation Record
b) Attractiveness of Lunchroom	Asked to comment on lunchroom, 52% of observers gave a comment classified as "attractive", i.e., clean, neat, bright, or actually used the adjective themselves. The 48% who thought otherwise referred to the lunchroom as "unattractive", "dull", "depressing", and "crowded".	General School Report
c) Play space	Of 50 comments on play space, 44 (88%) were positive. Observers liked both the facilities (playgrounds, gymnasia) and the programs they saw.	GSR
d) Library	Of 32 free response references to library (29), or to librarian (3) - 27 (85%) were positive. Observers noted the frequent use, good supply of books and competence of librarian, with the criticism referring to small, limited libraries.	GSR
e) Auditorium	15 comments on auditorium facilities were all positive.	GSR

11. Level of Aspiration

Using the same format as the Sociometric Inventory, the children were asked to indicate (on a class roster) those children who would "go on to college," those who would "finish high school but not go on to college," and those who would make "good doctors and lawyers." As with the sociometric data, the purpose here was to see if there was any group stereotyping. On all three items, the resident children selected children similarly to the basic proportions of children in the classes and so showed no stereotyping. Generally, the OE children selected on a similar basis, and any tendency to stereotype indicated that they thought larger proportions of OE children than the basic proportions would achieve college and make good doctors and lawyers.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Who would go on to college?	Generally all groups selected like the basic proportions. Only deviation was OE boys selecting selves slightly more and selecting resident girls slightly less than would be expected from the basic proportions.	Sociometric Inventory
b) Who will finish high school but not college?	All groups selected with no differences from the basic proportions.	SI
c) Who will make good doctors or lawyers?	OE boys picked themselves and OE girls more and residents less than the basic proportions. OE girls picked themselves more and resident boys less than the basic proportions. Resident boys and girls picked as the basic proportions.	SI

12. Impact of OE on School Attendance

Participation in the OE program had no consistent effect on attendance at school. This was true if one compared the attendance data for the 1965-66 school year for the OE, resident and matched sample children or if one compared the attendance rates for OE children in the sending and receiving schools.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Attendance 1965-66	No differences in attendance. During school year, median OE boy absent 10.5 days, resident boy, 13 days, and matching boys 9.7 days. Median OE girl absent 9.7 days, resident girl 11.9 days, matching girls 10.5 days.	Cumulative Record Card
b) Attendance in 1964-65 compared to 1965-66, for first year OE children	Across all grades, for boys 42% were absent less when in OE, 52% absent more, 6% same (48:52). For girls, 36% were absent less, 57% more, and 7% the same (43:57).	CRC

13. Impact on Reading Achievement

The data available on reading achievement presented in this section have been limited to those instances when the same test, the Metropolitan Achievement Test, was available for both a pre-score in October-November 1965, and a post-score in May 1966. Based on these data, all three groups (OE, resident and matched samples) averaged near normal progress for the seven or eight months of the school year which separated the two testing sessions with median gains of .74, .87 and .76 respectively. Nevertheless, at the end of the year about two-thirds of OE and matched sample children were reading at least .4 of a year below grade level, as were two-fifths of the resident children. Finally, the data indicated that within the sample of 212 OE and sending school children matched on reading grade in the sending school at the time the OE child left, the child who entered OE gained more 42% of the time, the child who remained in the sending school gained more 54% of the time, and they did not differ 4% of the time. While this pattern does not differ statistically at a significant level from chance, quite clearly, for this sample, there was no benefit in terms of reading achievement for those children who entered the OE program.

A different insight into academic functioning was provided by the observers' subjective evaluations of the academic success of the program. Referring primarily to the OE children, a large majority of the observers judged the program to be successful in its academic aspects.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Distribution at end of school year	As of May 1966, in grades 3 to 6, results were similar. Among residents, about 25% were reading within .4 of grade level, with about 35% more than .4 above, and 40% more than .4 below grade level. For OE and matched sample children, about 20% were within .4 of grade level, about 15% more than .4 above and about 65% more than .4 below grade.	Cumulative Record Card and Bd. of Education[1] data: Metro. Achievement Tests
b) Reading growth during 1965-66 b)1. Proportion of children who improved	In grades 3 and 4, 92% to 94% of OE and resident children gained in reading during the year, compared to 88% and 90% of the matched sample. In grades 5 and 6 it was 79% to 82% of the OE and resident children compared to 88% of matched sample.[2]	As above
b)2. Average Improvement	OE children overall averaged .74 of a grade gain in the 7 or 8 months between testings. Resident children gained more, averaging .87 of a grade gain in this period, and matched sample children averaged a gain of .74.	As above
b)3. Proportion of children who declined	In each grade there were proportions of children whose test data show a decline from Oct.-Nov. to May, usually of between .1 and .4 of a grade. For residents, this was about 4.5% in grades 3 and 4 and 16% to 18% in grades 5 and 6. OE children showed the same pattern, 5% to 7% in grades 3 and 4 but 14% to 16% in grades 5 and 6. Among matched sample children, it was 5% to 8% in each grade.	As above

---

[1] We are grateful to the New York City Board of Education for permitting us to send our staff to the Board in July to obtain the spring, 1966 reading scores as soon as they became available.

[2] Records for matched children in the sixth grade had been sent to their junior high school and so were not available to us.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
b)4. Who Declined	Of 65 resident children who declined, 72% had been reading above grade level on their Oct.-Nov. score, with almost a third reading more than 2 years above grade level. This suggests that one set of scores is misleading, possibly because of a ceiling effect of interacting test levels, a possibility which we could not test out. For OE children no such pattern was evident. Half of those who declined were reading above grade level in Oct.-Nov., and half below, and fewer than 10% were reading two or more years above grade level.	As above
c) Comparative Reading Achievement of OE and matched sample	Of 212 matched children, the child who entered OE gained more 89 times; there was no difference 9 times and the child who remained in the sending school gained more 114 times.	Met.Ach. Scores Oct.-May Matched Samples
d) Observers' Subjective Evaluation of Success of Academic Aspects of Program	On their final subjective reports, each observer was asked to evaluate the success of the academic aspects of the OE program, based on the school they had observed. 76% rated the academic aspect of the program "successful" and 24% rated it "unsuccessful." Those who thought it successful noted the good conditions for learning (i.e., re atmosphere, or discipline or standards), the positive attitudes of the school, the good teaching and the facilities. The minority who thought it unsuccessful noted lacks in teacher understanding of, or response to, the needs of the OE children, and lack of changes in methodology in response to varied levels of performance and functioning.	Observers' Subjective Report

14. Quality of Bussing Service

Asked both to rate and provide free response data as to various aspects of the bussing service after riding the bus home with the children, the observers assigned "good" ratings to its promptness (89%), convenience (68%), and the discipline maintained (33%) in descending order. In the free response data on bussing, the observers had both positive and negative comments on aspects such as the politeness-rudeness of the driver, the "crowded"-"not crowded" conditions, the brevity or length of the ride - these varied with the individual school or bus situation. They were all but unanimous in criticizing the lack of supervision on the busses and the behavioral problems they felt resulted from this lack of supervision.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Promptness of bussing service	89% of observers rated promptness as "good," 7% as "average," and 4% as "poor."	General School Report
b) Convenience of bussing service	68% of observers rated convenience as "good," 19% as "average," and 13% as "poor."	GSR
c) Discipline maintained on bus	33% of observers rated it as "good," 45% as "average" and 22% as "poor."	GSR
d) General comments on bussing	In addition to their ratings, about half of the observers added a free response about the bussing service. Comments categorized as about "driver," "conditions on bus" or "length of trip" were each about 50% favorable and 50% unfavorable. Of comments categorized as about "behavior of children" or "need for supervision," a heavy majority (92%) were critical of the behavior or lack of supervision.	GSR

15. Socio-Educational Descriptive Data

Data from the cumulative record card indicate that the great majority of OE, resident and sending school children were recorded as living in intact family units. A physiological comparison was provided by height and weight data, and these indicate no differences between OE and resident children with the only exception the fact that resident boys were heavier, on the average, in the upper grades.

The cumulative record cards also list two areas in which children could be listed as unsatisfactory. The first is the academic area, specifically involving six separate subject areas. The second is a personal and social adjustment area involving six separate aspects as well. In the academic area, if we consider all unsatisfactories ever received, the OE children had received more than either resident or matched sample children in "social studies" and in "mathematics and science." Otherwise differences, if any, were slight. However, if we consider only those received by OE and matched sample children in the sending school, the OE children had received fewer.

The pattern for the social and personal adjustment data was somewhat different. Considering all of the unsatisfactories received, OE boys and girls had received more than resident children, but the OE boys did not have more than the matched sample boys, although the OE girls did. Again, considering only those unsatisfactories received in the sending school, both OE boys and girls had received fewer than the matched sample children.

These analyses of the ratings for the sending school only are, of course, somewhat deceptive, since the OE children were in the sending schools for at least one year less than the matched sample children. The comparisons were made, however, to attempt to shed some light on the point often made by administrative and teaching staff that the children in the OE program were insufficiently screened and/or were not a representative sample of the children in the sending schools. Even allowing for the deceptiveness of the data, there is little support for that claim in these data on the unsatisfactories listed on the cumulative record card.

Finally, the data permitted an insight into school mobility as reflected in the number of schools attended. Obviously, the OE children had to attend one more school, and so this had to be allowed for in the data. Other than this, there were no differences in mobility between OE and resident children, but each of these groups was somewhat more stable than the sending school children.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
a) Family intactness	85% of OE compared to 91% of resident and 89% of matched sample lived in intact family units.	Cumulative Record Card
b) Height	For girls, OE and residents less than an inch apart, with OE always taller in grades 3 to 6. For boys, OE and residents were less than an inch apart with no pattern to the differences, i.e., OE taller in grades 4 and 5, residents in grades 3 and 6.	CRC
c) Weight	For girls, OE and resident children in grades 3 and 4 had mean weights within 1 pound: Grade 5, OE girls 6 pounds heavier on average; grade 6, resident girls 5½ pounds heavier on average. For boys, OE and resident children within 2 pounds in grades 3 and 4, residents 10 pounds heavier on average in grade 5, and 12 pounds heavier in grade 6.	CRC
d) Frequency of unsatisfactory ratings in subject performance: Language Arts	Proportion who had received an unsatisfactory was essentially similar in all three groups. Of residents, 27% of boys and 19% of girls had been rated "unsatisfactory" at some time in "language arts" compared to 33% of OE boys, 23% of OE girls, and 28% of matched boys and 19% of matched girls.	CRC

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
e) Frequency of Unsatisfactory Ratings in Subject Performance other than Language Arts e)1. Boys	Other than in "language arts," 2% to 10% of resident boys ever received an unsatisfactory. Of OE boys it was a similar 8% or 9% in "reading," "oral expression" and "health, music and art" but 23% in "social studies" and 34% in "math and science." Of matched sample boys, 9% and 13% received unsatisfactories in all fields except for "math and science" where 22% had received one. Thus OE boys had received more unsatisfactories in "social studies" and "math and science" than residents, and more in "social studies" than matched sample children.	CRC
e)2. Girls	Of resident girls, between 3% and 8% had received an unsatisfactory except for 17% who had received one in "math and science." For OE girls, it was a similar 6% and 8% in "reading," "oral expression" and "health, music and art" but 16% in "social studies" and 34% in "math and science." Of the matched sample, it was 6% to 9% in every subject. For girls, too, then, the OE sample had received more unsatisfactories than the resident or matched samples.	CRC
e)3. Comparison of OE and matched sample on ratings in subject performance in sending school only[1]	For boys, between 4% and 14% fewer OE than sending school children had ever received an unsatisfactory in a subject area, with the greatest difference in "language arts" (14%). For girls, between 5% and 11% fewer OE than matched children had ever received an unsatisfactory in the sending schools for all subjects except "math and science." Here, 6% more OE than matched sample girls had received an unsatisfactory in the sending schools.	CRC
f) Ratings of In Class Behavior: f)1. Boys	Of six characteristics rated on the cumulative record card[2] , between 23% and 35% of resident boys had received an "unsatisfactory" at some point in their school career, compared to between 32% and 50% of OE boys and 32% and 49% of sending school boys in matched sample.	CRC

---

[1] It should be remembered in these comparisons, that the matched sample children had at least one more year in the sending school in which to receive an unsatisfactory.

[2] These six characteristics are: gets along well with other children, obeys school rules and regulations, carries out responsibilities, is satisfied with a reasonable amount of attention, shows self control, participates to a reasonable extent in class.

Aspect of Evaluation	Finding	Source
f)2. Comparison of OE and matched sample boys on in-class behavior	On 4 of 6 specific characteristics, the proportion of OE and matched sample boys differed 3% or less. On 2, "gets along well" and "shows self control" 8% and 9% *fewer* of OE boys had ever received an unsatisfactory.	CRC
f)3. Girls	Of 6 characteristics, between 11% and 21% of resident girls had ever received an unsatisfactory compared to between 20% and 28% of OE girls and 10% and 25% of sending school girls in matched sample.	CRC
f)4. Comparison of OE and matched sample girls on in-class behavior	Of 6 characteristics, OE and matched sample girls differed 3% or less on "carries out responsibilities" and "participates...in class". On the other 4, between 7% and 11% more OE than matched sample girls had received an unsatisfactory.	CRC
f)5. Comparison of OE and matched sample on in-class behavior in *sending school only*[2].	Eliminating those unsatisfactories received in the *receiving* school, *for boys*, between 16% and 23% *fewer* OE than matched sample boys received unsatisfactories on each of the six characteristics. *For girls*, differences were 4% or less except for "carries out responsibilities" and "participates" where 10% and 13% *fewer* OE than matched sample children had ever received an unsatisfactory.	CRC
g) Number of Schools attended	65% of OE children had attended no other school than the receiving and sending school, compared to 64% of the resident children and 52% of children in the matched sample who had attended no other school. At the other end of the continuum 13% of OE children had attended 3 or more schools other than receiving and sending schools compared to 16% of resident and 18% of matched sample children.	CRC

Summary of Results

1. Quality of Instruction: Both in general and in specific subject areas, observers felt about 35% of lessons observed were above average, about 45% average and about 20% below average.

2. Awareness of OE: By a variety of criteria (seating, reciting, volunteering) a majority (62% to 84%) of times observers felt OE children functioned and were treated like resident children.

3. Observers' Rating of Teacher Functioning: On the 19 characteristics of the Ryans Scale, teachers were rated as average on about 6, above average on 12 and below average only on 1 because of the use of stereotyped rather than original techniques and routines.

4. School Staff Appraisal of Program: At each level two-thirds were "mildly" or "strongly" favorable but most of these would modify the program rather than retain it as is. Modifications suggested most often involve better screening, more services to receiving school, supervision on bus, coordination between sending and receiving school, and beginning in or using lower grades first. Commenting on the contributions of the program, most staff felt these lay in the area of improved ethnic relationships and understandings and improved educational opportunities for the OE children. The weaknesses paralleled the modifications suggested above.

5. Children's Appraisal of Program: a) OE children almost unanimously (90%) in favor, primarily because of better discipline and fewer fights, better schools and/or teachers so learning more, and physical facilities of receiving school.

b) resident children favored program (70%) on grounds of getting to know people or helping OE children attend a better school and get better education.

6. Observers' Appraisal of Program: a) If were OE parent, two-thirds of observers would feel positively or enthusiastically, one-third negatively.

b) If were resident parent, 60% positive or enthusiastic, 40% negative.

c) As selves, 58% said retain as is, 36% modify and 6% abolish. Modifications were almost exclusively in area of providing more remedial and therapeutic services in receiving schools and better teacher training re techniques. Of the 6% who said abolish, all but 1 had seen just an example of poor teaching. The exception had seen a class with what he perceived as segregated seating.

7. Children's Perception of School, Class and Classmates: Basically OE and residents had similar perceptions. On 2 separate instruments covering 39 aspects of school, class, staff and classmates, OE and resident children had same or similar (within 5%) response patterns on 16 items, differed slightly (6% to 10%) on 14 others, and were more than 10% apart on only 9 items. In all instances, the differences involved a smaller proportion of OE children holding a positive perception of class or school, but equally significant in almost all of these instances, even smaller proportions of children in the sending schools held a positive perception. On a variety of negative characteristics, OE children showed some tendency to select themselves more often than would be expected on basis of their proportion for class. Residents typically selected almost identically in terms of proportions in class.

8. Friendship Patterns: 98% of OE children and 96% of resident children report making friends with each other. The perception of resident children feeling friendly towards OE children is corroborated by the

data from "Picking Friends." In 80% of the classes every OE child was picked as a "very good" or "good" friend by at least 1 resident child. In only 3% of the classes were less than 1/2 of the OE children picked. In contrast, in only 30% of classes, every resident child was picked as a "very good" or "good" friend, and in 15% of the classes less than 1/2 of the resident children were so selected.

9. Socialization Beyond the Classroom: Observers generally felt that social aspects of the program were at least "partially successful" with most concern expressed about seating patterns in lunchrooms.

10. Physical Facilities: Observers were favorably impressed with the physical facilities they saw in the receiving schools.

11. Level of Aspiration: On aspiration items, all groups usually selected according to basic proportions. When this did not happen, the deviation involved OE selecting themselves more often.

12. Attendance: There were no differences in attendance among OE, resident and matched samples, and no differences for first year OE children between this year's OE attendance and last year's attendance in sending schools.

13. Reading: All 3 groups achieved near normal progress for the seven to eight month interval between testings: .74 for OE, .87 for resident, and .76 for matched sample children in the sending schools. Nevertheless, 40% of resident and 65% of OE and sending school children were reading at least .4 of a year below grade level at the end of the year. Of 212 matched children, the OE child gained more 89 times, and

the child who stayed in the sending school gained more 114 times, with 9 no different.

14. Bussing Service: After riding the busses, the observers were generally positive about the promptness and convenience but less so about the discipline maintained.

15. Socio-Educational Data: a) 85% OE, 89% matched, and 91% of resident samples resided in intact families.

b) Same proportion (65%) of OE children had attended only sending and receiving schools as resident children who had attended only 1 school.

c) Height and weight: no differences.

d) Ratings in subject performance: no differences in most subjects, but OE children more often rated unsatisfactory than matched sample children in "social studies" and "math and science."

e) Ratings in class behavior: more OE children than resident received unsatisfactories, but same or fewer OE boys than matched samples received unsatisfactories. For girls, the opposite was true; more OE than matched sample children received unsatisfactories.

f) Strikingly more boys than girls in OE, resident and matched samples received unsatisfactory in each of the behavior ratings.

LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In understanding what was and what was not done in this project, the time schedule involved must be taken into account. The project was begun on May 23 and project staff were in schools collecting data by May 31. Thus, in one week, instruments had to be developed and reproduced, staff recruited and briefed, and appointments made for the school visits. Through the efforts of several able and conscientious persons, all of these activities were completed so that the observational visits did start as planned, on May 31. Nevertheless, it was June 17th by the time all of the receiving schools were seen. This was considered too late to send observational teams into the sending schools, which would have been desirable to complete the design of the study. This time schedule also meant that we could not interview parents of any of the three groups of children in the study, nor did we believe we had sufficient time to elicit a representative sample of parent attitude by mail.

Other than these two omissions, we believe the project was implemented, to an astonishing degree, as it would have been had we had the traditional months for instrument development and research design. Questions would have been smoother and provision would have been made for easier coding of responses, but in the main - with the two exceptions noted - we believe the project represents what it would have been with more time available for pre-data collection activities.

The overall evaluation of the OE program depends on the criterion selected. In terms of reading achievement, for example, the children who entered OE gained nothing that those who remained in the sending schools did not.[1] In contrast, in terms of social interactions and making friendships across ethnic groups, everyone - staff, observers, and, most important, the resident and OE children - agreed that the program was extremely successful. Similarly, if you use the criterion of impression of school and class, the OE program would be considered successful. The OE children had essentially positive impressions of school, class and classmates. While, at times, smaller proportions of them had these positive impressions than was true of the resident children, nevertheless, in these same instances, larger proportions of OE than of sending school children had positive impressions. If you use the criterion of staff reaction, the program would be considered of doubtful success, since staff, on the record, communicated a feeling that their jobs had become more difficult and school discipline had declined; off the record, they reinforced this.[2]

---

[1] One wonders if this is not in some way tied to the weakness many staff and observers noted of the lack of remedial programs and personnel in the receiving schools. It may well be that the children who stayed in the sending schools had more remedial help available to them.

[2] If this investigator can be permitted a personal reaction, it seems that a striking omission from the responses of school administrative and teaching staff was any perception of the challenge represented by the OE program and any consistent feeling of satisfaction from participating in the educational aspect of the current social changes and developments in the United States. What seemed to run through the responses was that school staff would have been enthusiastic about the OE program if every disciplinary problem had been screened out and kept in the sending schools, if only academically able students had been sent, or if with the less academically able came large numbers of remedial staff.

The staff and observer considerations of strengths and weaknesses of the program and the modifications they suggested point up an interesting dichotomy. The strengths were all in the heart of the program itself: greater integration, ethnic interaction and understanding, children learning about each other's way of life and point of view, and improved educational opportunities for OE children. In contrast, the weaknesses and modifications all involved administrative aspects of the way in which the program was implemented. Lack of supervision on busses,[1] lack of orientation of resident and OE parents, or lack of orientation of children, poor coordination between sending and receiving schools, or insufficient personnel in receiving schools - if true - are weaknesses which can be remedied and many seem like administrative complications which might have been anticipated.

In conclusion, one is tempted to quote the Bible and note that "a little child shall lead them," for, despite the problems and administrative difficulties, the clearest positive evaluation comes from the liking of the children for the program and for each other.

---

[1] This problem of supervision on the busses would seem like a good area for developing a program whereby anti-poverty funds might be used to hire neighborhood adults to come on the busses with the children, be available to the receiving school staff during the day, and ride home with the children. Such a program might also make it possible to delay the ride home so that OE children could participate in after-school activities.

FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT--ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
PROJECT STAFF

Research Director

Dr. David J. Fox	Associate Professor and Director Office of Research and Evaluation Services School of Education, The City College of New York

Research Staff

Miss Nancy Abrams	Clinical Ass., CCNY Ed. Clinic (School Psych.)
Dr. Ruth R. Adams	Assoc. Prof., City College (Elem. Ed.) Sup. St. Tchrs.
Mr. Norman M. Alperin	Graduate Clinical Fellow, CCNY Ed. Clinic (School Psych.)
Dr. Leonard S. Blackman	Prof. of Ed., T.C., Columbia University (Spec. Ed.)
Miss Virginia Bodden	Student Principal, P.S. 1, Manhattan
Miss Ellen S. Borah	Student Teacher
Dr. B. Marian Brooks	Assoc. Prof., City College
Dr. Frederic L. Callahan	Asst. Prof., Hunter College, Education Dept.
Mrs. Gloria Chotin	Instructor, Dept. of Elem. Ed., NYU, Sup. St. Tchrs.
Dr. Helen H. Davidson	Professor, Dept. of Ed. (Psychology)
Dr. Harold Davis	Asst. Prof., Dept. of School Services, City College (Clin. Psychology)
Miss Saralee Dicker	Clinical Asst., CCNY Ed. Clinic
Dr. Maurice James Eash	Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Ed., Hunter College
Miss Sophie L. Elam	Asst. Prof., Schl of Ed (Social Psych.) Supervisor Group Work Program
Miss Sandra M. Epps	Research Asst., Dept. of Ed., City College Office of Research
Mr. Harwood Fisher	Lecturer in Ed., City College (Psych.)
Mrs. Louise W. Fox	Faculty Member, Psychology Dept., Finch College (Psych.)
Dr. Ralph H. Goldner	Prof. of Educational Psychology, NYU
Mrs. Naomi Gordon	Clinical Asst., Dept. of Ed., City College (School Psych.)
Miss Judith W. Greenberg	Instructor, S. of Ed., City College (Psych.)
Dr. William M. Greenstadt	Professor, School Services, City College (Clin. Psych.)
Dr. Ruth H. Grossman	Asst. Prof. of Ed., City College (El. Ed.) Sup. St. Tchrs
Dr. Frederick Hill, Jr.	Student - Ed. Admin., Bank St. School for Children
Mrs. Blanche E. Kauffman	School Psychologist, Bank St. School for Children
Dr. Hubert Kauffman	Asst.Prof. Schl. of Ed., City College (Clin. Psych.)
Dr. Abe S. Kramer	Assoc. Prof., Yeshiva University
Mr. Edward Leibowitz	Doctoral Candidate in school administration, Yeshiva Univ.
Mr. Robert J. Lovinger	Lecturer in Schl. of Ed., City College
Mrs. Marjorie M. McCarthy	Clinical Asst., Ed. Clinic
Dr. Bruce L. Maliver	Asst. Prof., City College
Miss Sandra G. Mattison	Student, T.C., Columbia Univ.
Dr. Samuel J. Meer	Assoc. Prof. of Ed., City College, Acting Director, Ed. Clinic
Dr. Edna O. Meyers	Chief, Psychological Therapy, Northside Center
Miss Debora C. Brink (Pansegrouw)	Lecturer, School of Ed., City College, Doctoral Candidate, T.C., Columbia Univ.
Dr. Bernard Peck	Assoc. Prof. of Ed., City College (Clin. Psych.)
Mrs. Joan Raim	Lecturer, Dept. of Ed., City College
Mrs. Anita Rich	Instructor, NYU (El. Ed.) - Sup. St. Tchrs.
Mrs. June L. Schwarz	Student Teacher
Mrs. Peggy M. Schwarz	Instructor, Dept. of El. Ed., City College
Dr. James J. Shields, Jrs.	Asst. Prof., City College (Sociologist)

(continued)

PROJECT STAFF

Mrs. Marietta E. Shore	Research Asst., Schl. of Ed., City College, Off. of Research
Dr. Marvin Siegelman	Asst. Prof., Social and Psychological Foundations, City College (Child Development)
Miss Judith Sigall	Clinical Asst., CCNY Ed Clinic
Mr. Louis Simon	Lecturer, City College, El. Ed. and Sup. St. Tchrs.
Dr. Madelon D. Stent	Asst. Prof. of Ed., City College El. Ed. - Sup.St. Tchrs
Dr. Charles Tanzer	Coordinator of Sciences and Prof. of Ed., Hunter College
Dr. William M. Wakefield	Psychologist-Lecturer, CCNY Ed. Clinic
Mr. Philip White	Lecturer, City College, El. Ed. -Sup. St. Tchrs.
Dr. Sigmund Tobias	Asst. Prof., School of Ed., City College (Psychologist)
Dr. Theresa A. Woodruff	Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Ed., City College of New York

Open Enrollment - Elementary School

OE: Principal's Interview

As you know, we are studying the Open Enrollment Program. Your School is one of those chosen for a more intensive exploration of the working of the program. We would like to ask you a few questions about the program, especially about the program this past year. Your answers to our questions will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our reports.

1. a) Name ______________________ b) School ______________________

   c) Age __________ d) Sex M F e) Race N W

2. What did you do before becoming principal here? ______________________

   ____

   a) At what school ______________ b) Where ______________

   c) For how long ______________

3. a) No. White Teachers ______________ b) No. Negro Teachers ______________

   No. OE children: c) Negro ______ d) White e) Puerto Rican ______ f) Others ______

   g) Total no. of children enrolled in school ______________

4. How long has OE program been in operation at your school? ______________

5. What do the teachers think of the program? (If response is "it depends," ask "On what....." in terms of alternates below:)

   a) No. of OE children ______________________

   b) Grade level taught ______________________

   c) Sex of teacher ______________________

   d) Age of teacher ______________________

   e) Race of teacher ______________________

   f) Homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping ______________________

   g) Others ______________________

   ____

6. No. of teachers who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

7. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(1)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

8. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(1)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Lightly Negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

9. What do the parents of the resident children think of the program?

10. Do they talk to you about it? a) Yes b) No

11. If negative, why?

12. If positive, why?

13. No. of parents who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

14. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

15. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Slightly Negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

16. How many contacts have you had with parents of OE children?

a) Many b) Some c) Few d) None

17. How does this compare with the frequency of your contacts with parents of resident children?

(a)	(b)	(c)
More than with resident parents	About the same as resident parents	Less than resident parents

18. What do the parents of the OE (or bussed in) children think of the program?

19. Do they talk to you about it? a) Yes b) No

20. If negative, why?

21. If positive, why?

22. No. of parents who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

23. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

24. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Slightly Negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

25. Have there been any administrative problems because of the OE program?

a) Yes b) No

If Yes, what?

26. How many would you say? a) Many b) Some c) Few d) None

27. How severe were they? a) Crucial b) Moderate c) Minor or unimportant

28. Typically how were these problems resolved?

29. In addition to what you have just told me, how has the OE program affected your job in particular?

30. a) More difficult b) About the same c) Less difficult

31. a) Substantial b) Moderate c) Slightly

32. How were these problems resolved?

33. How made it better?

34. Have there been changes with respect to methods of instruction? a) Yes b) No
If Yes, what?

35. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

36. a) Major b) Moderate c) Minor d) Insignificant

37. Have there been changes with respect to pupil achievement? a) Yes b) No

If Yes, what?

38. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

39. a) Greater b) Same c) Less achievement

40. Have there been changes with respect to discipline? a) Yes b) No

If Yes, what?

41. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

42. a) More b) c) Less

43. What do the white resident children think of the OE children in the school?

)a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't Know

44. What do the resident Negro children (if any) think of the OE children?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't Know

45. What do the OE children think of the OE Program?

(a)	)b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't Know

46. What do the OE children think of the resident children?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't Know

47. What do the OE children think of the teachers in this school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e(	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't Know

48. What do the OE children think of this school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Like Very Much	Like Moderately	Neutral	Dislike Moderately	Dislike Very Much	Don't Know

49. What do you think of the OE program in general?

(a)	(b)	(c)	)d)	)e)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable

50. What do you think of the OE children in your school?

(a)	(b)	)c)	(d)	(e)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable

51. What do you think are the most valuable contributions of the Open Enrollment Program as it is presently organized? (Consider the effects upon children, teachers, school, and community.)

52. What do you consider the major weaknesses of the Open Enrollment Program as it is presently organized? (Consider the effects upon children, teachers, school, and community.)

53. What modifications would you suggest in order to improve the Open Enrollment Program?

54. Finally, do you think the OE program should be continued as is, modified, or abolished?

a) Continued (b) Modified (c) Abolished (d) No Opinion

Open Enrollment - Elementary Teacher's Interview

As you know, we are studying the Open Enrollment Program. Your school is one of those chosen for a more intensive exploration of the working of the program. We would like to ask you a few questions about the program, especially about the program this past year. Your answers to our questions will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our reports.

1. a) Name________________________ b) School______________________________

c) Age_________ d) Sex M F e) Race N W

2. What did you do before teaching here?____

____

If prior teaching:

a) At what school?___________________ b) Where?_________________________

c) For how long?____________________________

3. Undergraduate education: a) Where?______________________________________

b) Major?__________________________________

4. Graduate education: a) Where?____

b) Major?__________________________________ c) Minor?__________________

d) No. of credits?__________________________

5. What do the other teachers think of the Program? (If answer is "It depends," ask "On what. . ." using the following alternatives as a guide.)

a) No. of OE children____

b) Grade level taught____

c) Sex of teacher____

d) Age of teacher____

e) Race of teacher____

f) Homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping_________________________________

g) Others____

6. No. of teachers who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

7. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

8. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Slightly Negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

9. What do the parents of the resident children think of the program?

10. Do they talk to you about it? a) Yes b) No

11. If negative, why?

12. If positive, why?

13. No. of parents who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

14. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

15. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Slightly Negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

16. What contacts have you had with parents of OE children?

a) Many b) Some c) Few d) None

17. How does this compare with the frequency of your contacts with parents of resident children?

(a)	(b)	(c)
More than with resident parents	About the same as resident parents	Less than resident parents

18. What do the parents of the OE (or bussed in) children think of the program?

19. Do they talk to you about it? a) Yes b) No

20. If negative, why?

21. If positive, why?

22. No. of parents who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

23. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

24. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Slightly Negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

25. Have there been changes with respect to your methods of instruction? a) Yes b) No
If yes, what were they?

26. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

27. a) Major b) Moderate c) Minor d) Insignificant

28. Have there been changes with respect to pupil achievement? a) Yes b) No
If yes, what were they?

29. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

30. a) Greater b) Same c) Less achievement

31. Have there been changes with respect to discipline? a) Yes b) No
If yes, what were they?

32. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

33. a) More b) Same c) Less

34. What were the reactions of the children to changes in methods of instruction, pupil achievement, and discipline? (This refers to OE children.)

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable	Don't know

35. What were the reactions of the resident children to changes, if any, in methods of instruction, pupil achievement, and discipline?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable	Don't know

36. What do the white resident children think of the OE children in the school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't know

37. What do the resident Negro children (if any) think of the OE children?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Rejecting	Don't know

38. What do the OE children think of the OE Program?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Rejecting	Don't know

39. What do the OE children think of the resident children?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't know

40. What do the OE children think of the other teachers in this school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Like Very Much	Like Moderately	Neutral	Dislike Moderately	Dislike Very Much	Don't know

41. What do the OE children think of this school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Like Very Much	Like Moderately	Neutral	Dislike Moderately	Dislike Very Much	Don't know

42. What do you think of the OE program in general?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable

43. What do you think of the OE children in your school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable

44. What do you think are the most valuable contributions of the Open Enrollment Program as it is presently organized? (Consider the effects upon children, teachers, school, and community.)

45. What do you consider the major weaknesses of the Open Enrollment Program as it is presently organized? (Consider the effects upon children, teachers, school and community.)

46. What modifications would you suggest in order to improve the Open Enrollment Program?

47. Finally, do you think the OE program should be continued as is, modified, or abolished?

a) Continued b) Modified c) Abolished d) No opinion

Open Enrollment - Elementary Schools - Remedial Teacher Interview

As you know, we are studying the Open Enrollment Program. Your school is one of those chosen for a more intensive exploration of the working of the program. We would like to ask you a few questions about the program, especially about the program this past year. Your answers to our questions will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our reports.

1. a) Name________________________ b) School________________________

c) Age__________ d) Sex M F e) Race N W

2. What did you do before coming to this school?________________________

____

If had prior school employment:

a) At What School________________________ b) Where________________

c) For How Long________________________

3. Undergraduate education: a) Where? ______________________________

b) Major? ________________________

4. Graduate education: a) Where? ________________________________

b) Major?________________________ c) Minor?________________________

d) No. of credits?________________________

5. What do the other teachers think of the program? (If response is "it depends,") ask "On what . . ." in terms of alternates below:

a) No. of CE children ________________________________

b) Grade level taught ________________________________

c) Sex of teacher __________________________________

d) Age of teacher __________________________________

e) Race of teacher _________________________________

f) Homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping ________________________

g) Others ____

____

6. No. of other teachers who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

7. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

8. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Slightly Negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

9. What do the parents of the resident children think of the program?

10. Do they talk to you about it? a) Yes b) No

11. If negative, why?

12. If positive, why?

13. No. of parents who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

14. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

15. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Slightly Negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

16. How many contacts have you had with parents of OE children?

a) Many   b) Some   c) Few   d) None

17. How does this compare with the frequency of your contacts with parents of resident children?

(a)	(b)	(c)
More than with resident parents	About the same as resident parents	Less than resident parents

18. What do the parents of the OE (or bussed in) children think of the program?

19. Do they talk to you about it?   a) Yes   b) No

20. If negative, why?

21. If positive, why?

22. No. of parents who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

23. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or strongly accepting	Accepting or mildly in favor	Doubtful but slightly positive

24. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but slightly negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

25. Have there been any modifications in the remedial instruction practices as a result of the OE program? a) Yes b) No

If Yes, what?

26. How many would you say? a) Many b) Some c) Few d) None

27. How severe were they? a) Crucial b) Moderate c) Minor or unimportant

28. Typically how are these problems resolved?

29. In addition to what you have just told me, how has the OE program affected your job in particular?

30. a) More difficult b) About the same c) Less difficult

31. a) Substantial b) Moderate c) Slightly

32. How were these problems resolved?

33. How made it better?

Now let us consider possible changes in your teaching as a result of having OE children.

34. Have there been changes with respect to methods of instruction? a) Yes b) No

If Yes, what were they?

35. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

36. a) Major b) Moderate c) Minor d) Insignificant

37. Have there been changes with respect to pupil achievement? a) Yes b) No

If Yes, what were they?

38. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

39. a) Greater b) Same c) Less achievement

40. Have there been changes with respect to discipline? a) Yes b) No

If Yes, what were they?

41. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

42. a) More b) Same c) Less

43. What do the white resident children think of the CE children in the school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't know

44. What do the resident Negro children (if any) think of the OE children?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't know

45. What do the OE children think of the OE Program?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't know

46. What do the OE children think of the resident children?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Accepting	Mildly Accepting	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't know

47. What do the OE children think of the teachers in this school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Like Very much	Like Moderately	Neutral	Mildly Rejecting	Strongly Rejecting	Don't know

48. What has been the reaction of the OE children to remedial contacts?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable	Don't know

49. What do the OE children think of this school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Like Very Much	Like Moderately	Neutral	Dislike Moderately	Dislike Very much	Don't know

50. What do you think of the OE program in general?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable

51. What do you think of the OE children in your school?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable

52. To what extent have the OE children utilized the remedial services?

a) Frequently   b) Moderately   c) Rarely

53. How does the OE children's utilization of your services compare with that of the resident children?

a) More utilization   b) About the same   c) Less utilization

54. What has been the reaction of the OE children to remedial contacts?

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Strongly Favorable	Mildly Favorable	Neutral	Mildly Unfavorable	Strongly Unfavorable	Don't know

55. What do you think are the most valuable contributions of the Open Enrollment Program as it is presently organized? (Consider the effects upon children, teachers, school, and community.)

56. What do you consider the major weaknesses of the Open Enrollment Program as it is presently organized? (Consider the effects upon children, teachers, school, and community.)

57. What modifications would you suggest in order to improve the Open Enrollment Program?

58. Finally, do you think the OE program should be continued as is, modified, or abolished?

a) continued b) modified c) abolished d) no opinion

Open Enrollment-Elementary Schools

Guidance Counselor Interview

As you know, we are studying the Open Enrollment Program. Your school is one of those chosen for a more intensive exploration of the working of the program. We would like to ask you a few questions about the program, especially about the program this past year. Your answers to our questions will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our report.

1. a) Name________________ b) School________________

   c) Age______ d) Sex M F e) Race N W

2. What did you do before becoming a guidance counselor?________________

   ____

   If prior school employment:

   a) At What School?________________ b) Where?________________

   c) For how long?________________

3. Undergraduate education: a) Where?________________

   b) Major?________________

4. Graduate education: a) Where?________________ b) Major?________________

   c) Minor?________________ d) No. credits?________________

5. What do the teachers think of the program? (If the response is "It depends," ask "On What ..." in terms of categories below:

   a) No. of OE children________________

   b) Grade level taught________________

   c) Sex of teacher________________

   d) Age of teacher________________

   e) Race of teacher________________

   f) Homogeneous or Heterogeneous grouping________________

   g) Others________________

   ____

6. No. of teachers who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

7. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a) Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting
(b) Accepting or Mildly in Favor
(c) Doubtful but Slightly Positive

8. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a) Doubtful but Slightly Negative
(b) Critical or Mildly Opposed
(c) Strongly Opposed

9. What do the parents of the resident children think of the program?

10. Do they talk to you about it? a) Yes b) No

11. If negative, why?

12. If positive, why?

13. No. of parents who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

14. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

15. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Slightly Negative	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

16. What contacts have you had with parents of OE children?

a) Many b) Some c) Few d) None

17. How does this compare with the frequency of your contacts with parents of resident children?

(a)	(b)	(c)
More than with resident parents	About the same as resident parents	Less than resident parents

18. What do the parents of the OE (or bussed in) children think of the program?

19. Do they talk about it? a) Yes b) No

20. If negative, why?

21. If positive, why?

22. No. of parents who like it:

a) All b) Most c) Half d) Very few e) None

23. Of those who like it, how would you characterize the extent of their liking?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Enthusiastic or Strongly Accepting	Accepting or Mildly in Favor	Doubtful but Slightly Positive

24. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize the extent of their dislike?

(a)	(b)	(c)
Doubtful but Slightly Positive	Critical or Mildly Opposed	Strongly Opposed

25. Have there been any administrative problems because of the OE program? a) Yes b) No
If yes, what were they?

26. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

27. a) Major b) Moderate c) Minor d) Insignificant

28. Have there been any modifications in the guidance program as a result of the OE children?
a) Yes b) No
If yes, what were they?

29. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

30. a) Major b) Moderate c) Minor d) Insignificant

Now let us consider possible changes in your guidance program as a result of having OE children.

31. Have there been changes with respect to methods of instruction? a) Yes b) No
If Yes, what were they?

32. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

33. a) Major b) Moderate c) Minor d) Insignificant

34. Have there been changes with respect to pupil achievement? a) Yes b) No
If Yes, what were they?

35. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

36. a Greater b) Same c) Less achievement

37. Have there been changes with respect to discipline? a) Yes b) No
If Yes, what were they?

38. a) Many b) Some (moderate) c) Few d) None

39. a) More b) Same c) Less

40. What do the white resident children think of the OE children in the school?

(a) Strongly Accepting (b) Mildly Accepting (c) Neutral (d) Mildly Rejecting (e) Strongly Rejecting (f) Don't Know

41. What do the resident Negro children (if any) think of the OE children?

(a) Strongly Accepting (b) Mildly Accepting (c) Neutral (d) Mildly Rejecting (e) Strongly Rejecting (f) Don't Know

42. What do the OE children think of the OE Program?

(a) Strongly Accepting (b) Mildly Accepting (c) Neutral (d) Mildly Rejecting (e) Strongly Rejecting (f) Don't Know

43. What do the OE children think of the resident children?

(a) Strongly Accepting (b) Mildly Accepting (c) Neutral (d) Mildly Rejecting (e) Strongly Rejecting (f) Don't Know

44. What do the OE children think of the teachers in this school?

(a) Like Very Much (b) Like Moderately (c) Neutral (d) Dislike Moderately (e) Dislike Very Much (f) Don't Know

45. What has been the reaction of the OE children to guidance contacts?

(a) Strongly Favorable
(b) Mildly Favorable
(c) Neutral
(d) Mildly Unfavorable
(e) Strongly Unfavorable
(f) Don't Know

46. What do the OE children think of this school?

(a) Like Very Much
(b) Like Moderately
(c) Neutral
(d) Dislike Moderately
(e) Dislike Very Much
(f) Don't Know

47. What do you think of the OE program in general?

(a) Strongly Favorable
(b) Mildly Favorable
(c) Neutral
(d) Mildly Unfavorable
(e) Strongly Unfavorable

48. What do you think of the OE children in your school?

(a) Strongly Favorable
(b) Mildly Favorable
(c) Neutral
(d) Mildly Unfavorable
(e) Strongly Unfavorable

49. To what extent have the OE children utilized the guidance services?

(a) Frequently
(b) Moderately
(c) Rarely

50. How does the OE children's utilization of your services compare with that of the resident children?

(a) More utilization
(b) About the same
(c) Less utilization

51. What do you think are the most valuable contributions of the Open Enrollment Program as it is presently organized? (Consider the effects upon children, teachers, school, and community.)

52. What do you consider the major weaknesses of the Open Enrollment Program as it is presently organized? (Consider the effects upon children, teachers, school, and community.)

53. What modifications would you suggest in order to improve the Open Enrollment Program?

54. Finally, do you think the OE Program should be continued as is, modified, or abolished?

a) Continued
b) Modified
c) Abolished
d) No opinion

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Open Enrollment - Elementary Schools

OE Children Informal Interview

1) Introduction. We're studying things about this school and other schools. We would like to know some of your feelings and opinions.

2) We know you come from another school. (a) Where is the other school?

_________________________ (b) Do you come far on the bus? ____________

(c) Which school do you like better? ________________

Sending ______________ Receiving ____________________

Why? ____

____

____

____

3) (a) Have you made friends here? Yes ________ No __________

(b) About how many friends have you made /PROBE: 2? 3? none?7 __________

(c) Who are these friends? Did you meet them here? Or did they come with you on the bus?

Bus _______ Here ___________

4) (a) Do you have to do much homework here?

Yes ________ No ____________

(b) Do you do more homework here than at the other school?

Yes ________ No ____________

____

____

5) Do you get special help with your work here?

Yes ________ No ____________

If yes: More than in the other school? Tell me about it.

If no: Did you get special help in the other school?

6) Do you do any special things here that you didn't do at the other school?

Yes ____ No ____

What are they? ____

7) How do you like it here?

/PROBE: Would you like to stay here next year or go back to your other school?/

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

OPEN ENROLLMENT -ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

White Resident Informal Interview

School________________________________ Grade________________________________

Sex________________

Introduction: We're studying things about this school and other schools. We would like to know some of your feelings and opinions.

1. Some of the children in this school and in your class come from other schools. Why do you think these children come here instead of going to the school where they live?

____

____

____

2. What do you think about it? (Is it a good idea?)

____

____

____

3. (a) Have you made friends with these children?

Yes__________ No__________

(b) About how many friends have you made?________________________________

(c) If not: Why not?____

____

4. Are things much different here now than before?

Yes________________ No______________

If yes, tell me about it____

____

____

Open Enrollment - Elementary

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION REPORT

School________________ Borough______________ Class_____ Grade____ Observer______________

1. Content of Lesson: 1) Reading 2) Arith. 3) Science 4) Soc. St. 5) ____________

2. How good a lesson was this? 1) Excellent 2) Good 3) Average 4) Poor 5) Very poor

3. If poor, why? ____

4. Participation of O.E. children in lesson; COMPARED to resident children:

a) in spontaneous questioning:	1) more	2) same	3) less	4) almost none	5) can't tell
b) volunteering responses to teacher questions:	1) more	2) same	3) less	4) almost none	5) can't tell
c) in being called on by teacher:	1) more	2) same	3) less	4) almost none	5) can't tell
d) in working (i.e. in workbooks):	1) more	2) same	3) less	4) almost none	5) can't tell

5. Was grouping employed? No Yes

6. If yes, what was rationale for grouping as expressed by teacher? ______________

7. Were O.E. children dispersed in the various groups? No Yes

8. If not, how were they grouped? ______________________________

9. How were the O.E. children seated in the regular classroom:
1) throughly dispersed 2) somewhat clustered 3) clustered ________________
where?

10. How would you rate the attractiveness of the classroom?
1) above average 2) average 3) below average

11. Did you see any evidence that the O.E. children share in classroom responsibility?
1) yes 2) no evidence, but opportunity 3) no opportunity to observe this

12. How typical do you think this lesson was of what happened in this classroom?
1) completely typical 2) reasonable approximation 3) less than a reasonable approximation Why? ________________

13. If you were not on this project and had visited this classroom, to what extent would you have been aware that some children were bussed in?
1) not at all 2) slightly 3) definitely

14. If you circled slightly or definitely, why? __________________________

Open Enrollment - Elementary

CLASS RATING SCALE

Complete at the end of the observation period:

1. How would you rate the class you have just seen; considering the quality of instruction?

   a) outstanding b) good, better than average c) average d) poor e) extremely poor

2. How would you rate the participation of the O.E. children?

   a) more than resident children b) same as resident children c) less than resident children

3. If this were typical of the instruction received in this class throughout the year, how would you feel about having a child of yours in the class?

   A. If you were the parent of a resident child:

   a) enthusiastic b) slightly positive c) slightly negative d) strongly negative

   B. If you were the parent of an Open Enrollment child:

   a) enthusiastic b) slightly positive c) slightly negative d) strongly negative

4. If this class was typical of the quality of instruction received by all children, how would you feel about Open Enrollment:

   a) retain as is b) modify c) abolish

   If you said modify, how?____

   ____

   ____

Any other comments on this lesson you feel should be part of the record?

Open Enrollment - Elementary School

General School Report

School ________________ Observer ____________________

Use this sheet to enter your observations on the other facilities you observe. Please be brief and evaluative in your comments.

1. Lunchroom: comment on seating ____________________

attractiveness ____________________

interaction among children ____________________

teacher-pupil relationship ____________________

other comments ____________________

2. Other special facilities observed.

a) ____________________

b) ____________________

c) ____________________

d) ____________________

3. How would you rate the over-all attitude of the teachers you met and talked with at lunch? regarding open enrollment? First, how many favor it?

1) all 2) most 3) half 4) very few 5) none

4. Of those who favor it, how would you characterize their liking?

1) enthusiastic 2) mildly in favor 3) doubtful, but slightly positive

5. Of those who dislike it, how would you characterize their dislike?

1) doubtful, but slightly negative 2) mildly opposed 3) strongly opposed

Open Enrollment - Elementary School

General School Report
(continued)

6. How many teachers did you speak to at lunch? ____________________

7. Did the sex of the teacher seem to have any effect on opinion? No.___ Yes___

8. If yes, in what way? ____

____

9. Did you notice any other consistent pattern of opinion which seemed related to some socio psychological characteristic? No___ Yes ___

10. If yes, what characteristic? ______________, and how related to opinion?__________

____

____

Bussing:	enter comment on:	promptness:	good	average	poor
		convenience:	good	average	poor
		discipline:	good	average	poor

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 W. 42nd St. NYC

Educational Practice Division
Title I Evaluation

Open Enrollment - Elementary School

Current grade or subject ____________________
Teacher's Name ____________________ Number of times observed in class __________

PART II: TEACHER BEHAVIOR RECORD IN THE CLASSROOM

On the basis of teacher behavior observations in the classroom, check one of the seven choices for each of the following categories. A low number indicates that a person is more like the description on the left. A high number indicates that a person is more like the description on the right. Number 4 is midway between each pair of opposite descriptions. Number 4 represents non-extreme, average behavior.

		Mid-Point		
1. Autocratic: told pupils each step to take; gave mandatory directions; intolerant of pupils' ideas	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Democratic: encouraged ideas, opinions, and decisions of pupils; guided without being mandatory
2. Aloof: stiff and formal with pupils; focus on subject matter and routine; pupils as persons ignored	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Responsive: approachable to all students; gave encouragement and spoke to pupils as equals; recognized individual differences
3. Dull: uninteresting, monotonous explanations; lacked enthusiasm; not challenging	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Stimulating: held attention of pupils; enthusiastic; interesting and challenging material
4. Partial: slighted or criticized a few pupils, or gave attention and special advantages to a few pupils	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Fair: treated all pupils about equally; distributed attention to many pupils
5. Apathetic: listless: preoccupied; bored by pupils	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Alert:bouyant: constructively busy; wide-awake; interested in class activity

(PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE)

		Mid-Point		
6. Unsympathetic: little concern for personal problems of pubils or pupil failure; impatient with pupils	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Understanding: patient and sympathetic with pupil viewpoints and needs; aware of pupil problems
7. Stereotyped: used routine procedures without variation; unimaginative presention	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Original: used unique teaching devices; imaginative; had wide variety of illustrations
8. Harsh: hypercritical; cross, sarcastic; scolding	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Kindly: pleasant and helpful to pupils; friendly and concerned
9. Inarticulate: inaudible speech; limited expression; disagreeable voice tone; poor inflection	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Fluent: plainly audible speech; good expression; agreeable voice tone; good inflection
10. Unattractive: untidy; inappropriately dressed; poor posture and bearing; distracting personal habits	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Attractive: well-groomed and dressed; good posture and bearing; no distracting personal habits
11. Evading: avoided responsibility and decisions; assignments and directions indefinite; help inadequate	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Responsible: made required decisions; conscientious; gave definte directions; thorough
12. Erratic: impulsive, uncontrolled, inconsistent	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Steady: controlled; stable; consistent; predictable
13. Uncertain: unsure of self; hesitant; timid; faltering, artificial	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Confident: sure of self; self-confident; undisturbed by mistakes and/or criticism
14. Excitable: easily disturbed and upset; "jumpy"; nervous	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Calm: seemed at ease at all times; poised; dignified but not stiff or formal
15. Disorganized: objectives not apparent; explanations not to the point; wasted time; easily distracted from matter at hand	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Systematic: careful planning; gave reasonable explanations; objectives apparent; not easily distracted

(PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE)

		Mid-Point		
16. Inflexible: rigid in conforming to routine; made no attempt to adapt materials and activities to individual pupils	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Adaptable: flexible in adapting explanations: individualized materials for pupils as required; adapted activities to pupils
17. Pessimistic: skeptical; unhappy; noted mistakes more than good points; frowned	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Optimistic: cheerful; good-natured; genial; looked on bright side; called attention to good points
18. Immature: naive; self-pitying; demanding; boastful; conceited	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Integrated: maintained class as center of activity; kept self out of spotlight; mature; emotionally well controlled
19. Narrow: limited background in subject or material; poor scholarship; incomplete or inaccurate information	1 2 3	4	5 6 7	Broad: good background in subject; good scholarship; gave complete and accurate answers to questions

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment - Elementary Schools

To: Observer Consultants
From: David J. Fox
Re: Your request for opportunity to write a subjective evaluation.

Several of you who have already been in the schools have expressed the feeling that the forms you complete do not fully provide you with an opportunity to say all you have to say, and all that we should hear, particularly in the sense of your over-all subjective evaluation. We have, therefore, prepared the form below, which we hope will provide this opportunity, and yet keep the data within manageable scope.

In the spaces below, indicate your over-all subjective evaluation of the points of view of the different people indicated, and then of the total program.

1. Based on your visit to P.S._____, how do you feel each of the following feel about the Open Enrollment Program? Where you feel you can, indicate both the opinion you believe the persons hold AND why you think they hold it.

   A. The Principal: His opinion

      Why does he hold this opinion?

   B. The Teachers: Their Opinion

      Why do they hold this opinion?

   C. The Resident Children: Their Opinion

      Why do they hold this opinion?

   D. The Open Enrollment Children: Their Opinion

      Why do they hold this opinion?

2. Based on your visit to P.S.______, how do you feel about the success of the program? Again, please indicate both your opinion AND why you feel this way.

   A. Comment on the success of the program in terms of the academic aspects.

   B. Now comment on the success of the program in terms of its personal or social aspects.

3. Please use the space below for any other comments you feel we should hear, based on this visit.

Open Enrollment - Elementary

Name____ Class____________ School_____________________

MY CLASS

We would like to find out how you feel about your class. Here are 20 sentences about a class. I am going to read each sentence to you. You are to ask yourself, "Does this sentence tell about my class?" Then mark the answer you like best. Do it like this:

SAMPLE

A. I go to school. (Yes) No I'm not sure

B. We do to school on Saturday. Yes (No) I'm not sure

1. It is hard to make real friends in this class.............. Yes No I'm not sure
2. Nearly everyone in this class wants to work hard........... Yes No I'm not sure
3. The children in this class are happy and pleased when you do something for them.................................... Yes No I'm not sure
4. Many children in this class are not fair................... Yes No I'm not sure
5. We need a better classroom to do our best work............. Yes No I'm not sure
6. Nearly everyone minds his or her own business.............. Yes No I'm not sure
7. You can really have a good time in this class.............. Yes No I'm not sure
8. One or two children in this class spoil everything......... Yes No I'm not sure
9. Everyone tries to keep the classroom looking nice.......... Yes No I'm not sure
10. We don't have a lot of the things we need to do our best work .... Yes No I'm not sure
11. The children in this class are pretty mean................. Yes No I'm not sure
12. A lot of children in this class don't like to do things together .... Yes No I'm not sure
13. Everyone gets a chance to show what he or she can do....... Yes No I'm not sure
14. Nearly everyone in this class is polite.................... Yes No I'm not sure
15. I don't feel as if I belong in this class.................. Yes No I'm not sure
16. Most of the children in this class do not want to try anything new.. Yes No I'm not sure
17. Nearly everyone in this class can do a good job if he or she tries.. Yes No I'm not sure
18. A lot of the children look down on others in the class..... Yes No I'm not sure
19. You can trust almost everyone in this class................ Yes No I'm not sure
20. We do a lot of interesting things in this class............ Yes No I'm not sure

Open Enrollment - Elementary Schools

Name ______________________________ Class ____________________ School ________________

MY SCHOOL

Now we would like you to tell us how you feel about your school. Here are some things that some boys and girls say about their school. Are these things true about your school? If they are very true for your school, circle the big "YES!" If they are pretty much true, but no so very true, circle the little "no". If they are not at all true, circle the big "NO!"

1. The teachers in this school want to help you. YES! yes no NO!
2. The teachers in this school expect you to work too hard. YES! yes no NO!
3. The teachers in this school are really interested in you. YES! yes no NO!
4. The teachers in this school know how to explain things clearly. YES! yes no NO!
5. The teachers in this school are fair and square. YES! yes no NO!
6. The boys and girls in this school fight too much. YES! yes no NO!
7. This school has good lunches in the cafeteria. YES! yes no NO!
8. This school building is a pleasant place. YES! yes no NO!
9. The principal in this school is friendly. YES! yes no NO!
10. The work at this school is too hard. YES! yes no NO!
11. What I am learning will be useful to me. YES! yes no NO!
12. The trip to and from school is too long. YES! yes no NO!
13. I wish I didn't have to go to school at all. YES! yes no NO!
14. This is the best school I know. YES! yes no NO!
15. The work at this school is too easy. YES! yes no NO!
16. I work hard in school but don't seem to get anywhere. YES! yes no NO!
17. I've learned more this year than any earlier year. YES! yes no NO!

How long do you want to go to school? (Check one.)

__________ Only until I'm old enough to quit.

__________ Through high school but no more.

__________ I want to go to college.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 W. 42nd St. NYC

Educational Practice Division
Title I Evaluation

Open Enrollment - Elementary School

Sociometric and Aspirations

Inventory

1. Who are the children who always sit around you?
2. Who is absent from school a lot?
3. Who talks out to get attention?
4. Who has lots of friends?
5. Who says mean things?
6. Who just seems sort of lost?
7. Who seems to think they are nobody?
8. Who takes other children's things without asking?
9. Who do all the kids like?
10. Who pushes or shoves children?
11. Who doesn't want to play?
12. Who starts a fight over nothing?
13. Who is sort of unhappy?
14. Who wants to show off in front of the kids?
15. Who does things that bother others?
16. Who do you know best of all?
17. Who is sort of ignored?
18. Who makes up stores and lies to get other children into trouble?
19. Who says they can't do things?
20. Who gives dirty looks or sticks out their tongue at other children?
21. Who do you like to play with?
22. Who are the children that nobody plays with?
23. Who often says, "Give me that"?
24. Who is not sure of himself or herself in anythings?
25. Who would you like to sit next to in class?
26. Who does not obey the teacher?
27. Who always plays alone?
28. Who always messes around and gets into trouble?
29. Who feels left out?
30. Who always plays the clown and wants everyone to laugh at him or her?
31. Who are the children you think will go on to college?
32. Who are the children you think will finish high school but not go to college?
33. Who are the children you think will make good doctors or lawyers?

Now at this point pause and say:

Now on this page, we are going to do something different.

Open Enrollment
Elementary

Recorder ______________ Pupil Record Form for: OE Res Match

Name ______________________________________ School: P.S. _______ Borough ______

Sex: M F Age: __ Current Grade: ___ Last IQ: ___ Reading Grade: ___ as of: ___

A: School History: (enter school & date admitted)
1. ____________________ date
2. ____________________ date
3. ____________________ date
4. ____________________ date
5. ____________________ date
6 ____________________ date

B: IQ: (enter IQ and date and name of test)
1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________
5. ____________________
6. ____________________

C. Reading: (enter average GE if available - if not, enter comprehension & vocab. separately enter date as well

	Date	Comp	Date	Vocab.	Date	Ave.	Date	Comp	Date	Prob. Sol.	Date	Ave.
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6												

D. Mathematics - use right hand of above grid. Enter average if available. If not enter computation and problem-solving separately.

E. Teachers Comments on non-conforming test results: NONE Some: see below
1. ________ Test ________ Comment
2. ____________________
3. ____________________)

F. Attendance: Days absent: 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___ 6___
Days late: 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___ 6___

G. Guidance Data: enter grade for which any UNSATISFACTORY has been checked:
a) gets along____ b) obeys____ c) carries out____ d) satis____ e) show___ f)part ___

H. Special Reports, Abilities or Disabilities: NONE SOME. If some, note on back.

I. Subject Performance Enter subject & grade of all EXCELLENT or UNSATISFACTORY

EXCELLENTS	UNSATISFACTORIES

J. Health: Enter any serious illness or deviation from normal. Enter current ht___ wt___

K. Family: Living with M & F M only F only other_____ Sibling Position: No.____ of ____
M birthplace______________ F birthplace______________ Child's BPl______

L. Other: Enter any other information of relevance as you scan the records.

Open Enrollment - Elementary

PICKING FRIENDS

Directions: On a separate sheet you will find the name of every student in your class. We want you to put a number on the line in front of every name. First, put a zero (0) in front of your own name.

Are there any people in this room whom you would like to have as your very, very best friends? If so, place the number 1 in front of their names.

1 "Very, very best friends."

*****

Put the number 2 in front of the name of every person whom you would like to have as a good friend. These people are not your very, very closest friends, but you would like them to be good friends of yours.

2 "Good friends."

*****

Put the number 3 in front of the name of every person who is not a friend, but who you think is all right. These are people with whom you would just as soon work or play. You think they are all right. They are not friends, but they are okay just the same.

3 "Not friends but okay."

*****

Put the number 4 in front of the name of every person whom you don't know very well. Maybe you would like them and maybe you wouldn't. You don't know. Where you don't know a person well enough to rate him or her, put the number 4 in front of that name.

4 "Don't know them."

*****

After you have given the numbers 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 to people in the room, there may be some names that you haven't marked yet. You know these people but they are not friends of yours and, in general, are not okay to you. Put the number 5 in front of all these names.

5 "Not okay."

Further Directions: Start with the top of the class list and go down, making sure there is one number, and only one number, in front of every name. When you come to your own name, put a zero (0) in front of it.